STUDIES IN FRONTO AND HIS AGE

M. DOROTHY BROCK

GIRTON COLLEGE STUDIES No. V

20764
Brook

St. Procopius
College Library
LISLE, ILL.

Borrowers are responsible for all books taken out on their cards.

Books may be kept for two weeks and renewed once for the same period, except fiction, 7-day, and reserved books.

A fine of one cent per day will be charged on each book which is not returned according to the above rule.

GIRTON COLLEGE STUDIES
EDITED BY LILIAN KNOWLES, LITT.D., READER IN ECONOMIC HISTORY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

No. 5

STUDIES IN FRONTO AND HIS AGE

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER

Edinburgh: 100, PRINCES STREET
Berlin: A. ASHER AND CO.
Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS
New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

All rights reserved

STUDIES IN FRONTO AND HIS AGE

WITH AN APPENDIX ON AFRICAN LATINITY ILLUSTRATED BY SELECTIONS FROM THE CORRESPONDENCE OF FRONTO

BY

M. DOROTHY BROCK, B.A.

SOMETIME PFEIFFER STUDENT OF GIRTON COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

ST. PROCOPIUS COLLEGE LIBRARY
LISLE
ILL.

Cambridge :
at the University Press
1911

870
B78

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

20764

PREFACE

MY first impulse to study the Correspondence of Fronto came from a chapter in Prof. Mackail's *Latin Literature*; and having read Fronto before I read his critics I may claim to have come to him without bias, save for the vague feeling that there might be something more than pedantry in this man upon whom antiquity showered its praises and Marcus Aurelius his love. That any attempt to reinstate Fronto is foredoomed to failure is the unanimous and cheering verdict of those critics. My aim is rather to enable Fronto himself to state his claim (for the first time) not to a blind admiration, as a "Second Cicero," but to sober respect and a just appreciation, not only as orator, stylist and literary critic, but as the leader of an important literary revival and the founder of that "New Latin" of which the Romance languages are the direct descendants.

I have quoted largely throughout; but, since in most cases the quotations have been brief illustrations of some particular point, I have appended a continuous text of

certain of the most important Letters, in order to give some idea of the Correspondence as a whole. With this text I have given an English translation (in parts of which I am indebted to renderings by Prof. Robinson Ellis, Dr W. H. D. Rouse and Mr Hastings Crossley, as well as to Walter Pater's versions in *Marius the Epicurean*), and a few brief explanatory notes on the date and subject-matter.

A palimpsest, exceedingly difficult to decipher, of which no edition has appeared for more than forty years, is not an easy text upon which to work. Indeed, pending the appearance of Dr Edmund Hauler's forthcoming edition, it is necessary practically to reconstruct a new text for oneself, by the help of the numerous emendations which, since the publication of Naber's text, have appeared from time to time in various periodicals and pamphlets. A glance at the Bibliography (itself by no means exhaustive) will testify to the amount of critical work which has been done upon Fronto both before and since 1867, when Naber's edition appeared. These extraordinary textual difficulties, the complications of copyright, and the prospect of the speedy publication of Dr Hauler's text, led me to abandon my original idea of publishing a complete edition.

The Appendix on African Latinity speaks for itself. The question whether African Latin was the Latin of an epoch or the Latin of a country is one of great interest, especially in view of its relation to the Latin of the Early Christian Church, and it deserves more attention

than it has yet received in this country. In examining and rejecting the "local dialect" theory I have endeavoured throughout to connect literary evidence with that of the inscriptions; and, although the scope of this Appendix necessarily extends far beyond Fronto and his immediate followers, the discussion of this question is not out of place here, inasmuch as Fronto was himself the first great African author and the founder of the African School.

I may add that to the best of my belief references have been verified throughout. In some cases I have found that my references are identical with those cited by Signor Achille Beltrami in *Le tendenze letterarie negli scritti del Frontone*,—a book which I did not see until my chapter on Fronto's oratory was almost complete, but to which I owe some additional references which had not come to my notice.

I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my indebtedness to the Council of Girton College, Cambridge, for the Research Studentships which made this work possible, and to the Committee of the Girton College Publication Fund for the grant which secured its inclusion in this series. To Prof. Robinson Ellis, Corpus Professor of Latin in the University of Oxford, I am indebted for suggestions and advice, especially in the initial stages, and to Dr Edmund Hauler, of Vienna, for his kindly interest. I should like especially to thank Miss K. Jex-Blake, Vice-Mistress and Director of Classical Studies of Girton College, Cambridge, for her help with

the translation and for the many kindnesses which she has shown me throughout; and Mr T. R. Glover, Fellow and Classical Lecturer of St John's College, Cambridge, University Lecturer in Ancient History, for the wise counsel and invaluable help which he has given me, from the day when he read my first rough manuscript until his correction of the final proof-sheet.

M. DOROTHY BROCK.

August 1911.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	PREFACE	v
I.	INTRODUCTION	
	Fronto's reputation in antiquity	1
	History of the Manuscript	2
	Life of Fronto	11
II.	THE AGE.	
	The decline of Latin Literature	13
	Causes and symptoms of this decline	15
	The decay of civic life and its effect upon oratory	17
	The spread of dilettantism	20
	The pressure of external circumstances and the effect of the Principate on literature	21
III.	ARCHAISM.	
	The relation of Archaism to Atticism and vulgarism	25
	Gradual development of the archaistic movement from Sallust to Martial	27
	Its relation to Classicism	32
	Immediate causes of the Frontonian revival	33
	The relation of the provinces to the movement	34
IV.	GRAECISM.	
	The influence of Greek upon Roman Literature	36
	Atticism and Asianism in Latin rhetoric	37
	Opposition of Fronto to Hellenism	38
	Atticism of his own Greek writing	41

CHAP. PAGE

V. Marcus Aurelius.

Illustrations from the Letters of the Emperor's life and character in boyhood and youth . 42
His debt to Fronto 51
His attitude towards rhetoric 53

VI. Lucius Verus.

The judgment of the Letters upon Lucius Verus more favourable than that of the historians 57
Fronto's tribute to Verus' military reforms, and the probability of this view being correct . 59

VII. Fronto as a Historian.

His conception of history as a species of rhetorical exercise 62
Fragmentary condition of his historical writings. The *Principia Historiae* a panegyric upon Lucius Verus 63
Origin of the rhetorical conception of history . 65
Historical value of the correspondence . . 66
Light thrown on Verus and the two Faustinas, 68
on Antoninus Pius 71
and on Trajan and Hadrian . . . 72
References to the encampment in Britain, and to provincials in the Roman Senate . . 73
References to the letter of Catulus and to the *Consilia* of Asinius Pollio 74

VIII. Fronto's opposition to Philosophy.

Feud between rhetoric and philosophy . . 78
Fronto's ridicule of philosophy and especially of Stoicism 79
The bitterness of the *de Eloquentia* . . . 80
The duty of an Emperor towards rhetoric . 84

CHAP. PAGE

IX. Religion.

The problem of the bereavement of Victorinus 85
Orthodox piety and absence of religious conviction in Fronto 87
The religious movements of the age . . . 88
The vagueness of Marcus Aurelius' belief, affording a possible explanation of his attitude towards the Christians 89
Evidence of the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix as to Fronto's *Oratio* against Christianity . 93
Attempted identification of Caecilius with Fronto 94
Superstition of the age shared by Marcus Aurelius 95

X. Fronto's Theory of Oratory and Style.

The place of eloquence in the Roman Empire . 97
Oratory a necessary equipment for an Emperor 100
Fronto's conception of eloquence and the importance which he attaches to the choice of words 101
Comparison of the *Elocutio Novella* with the Romantic movements in other literatures . 104
The doctrine of the one right word . . . 107
The distinction between synonyms . . . 111
Comparison of Fronto's theory with that of Walter Pater and J. A. Symonds . . 113
The arrangement of words 115
Practical advice to young orators . . . 117
"*Nugalia*" 121
Relation between poetry and prose . . . 123

XI. Fronto as a Literary Critic.

Fronto's literary criticism the natural outcome of his theory of style 125
His canon of Roman poets, orators and historians 126
Censure of Seneca 128
Criticism of Lucan 131
His love for Plautus and the old writers . 132

CHAP. PAGE

His high opinion of Cicero, especially of the Letters; criticism of Cicero's vocabulary . 133
Absence of references to Augustan and Flavian writers 137

XII. Fronto's Vocabulary and Style.

The beginnings of the *Elocutio Novella*, later perfected by Apuleius 140
Difficulty of analysing the change 141
"The Fable of Sleep" 142
Prevalence of short, broken rhythms, asyndeton and anacoluthon, and revival of assonance and alliteration 144

XIII. Fronto's Character.

The subject-matter of the Letters strictly personal 150
Fronto's naturalness; his love of children, . 151
purity of thought and language, . . . 152
keenness as a teacher, truthfulness, . . . 153
warmheartedness, and sympathy, . . . 154
loyalty in friendship, ... 155
common sense 156
His allusions to his ill-health 157
His provincial command 158

Conclusion 159

Appendix on African Latinity . . 161

Absence of contemporary non-African Latin with which to compare that of the African school 163
Dr Karl Sittl's theory of a distinct local dialect in Africa 164
Position of the opponents of this theory . . 165
The relation between the *Sermo plebeius* and the *Sermo urbanus* 167
Sources of our knowledge of Vulgar Latin . 171
Arguments in favour of an African Latin dialect 175
Evidence for provincial pronunciation . . 176

CHAP. PAGE

Classification of Africanisms under four heads:

(i) Archaism 181
The theory of Wölfflin and Monceaux 182

(ii) Vulgarism, due to 185

A. The weakening of organic forms and the substitution of analytic for synthetic usages . . . 186 196

B. The breaking down of the barriers between verse and prose . 201

(iii) Graecism 202

(iv) The effects of rhetoric as seen in (1) pleonasm of all varieties . . . 208

(2) Certain stylistic devices and ornaments 218

Comparison of African literature with African art 230
Evidence of inscriptions 232
Conclusions of Kübler and Kroll . . . 233
Peculiarities of word-formation 235
vocabulary 248
and orthography in African inscriptions . 254
Conclusion: African Latin practically free from provincialism. This phenomenon due to the spread of education 257
African Latin the Latin of an epoch not of a country 260

TEXT (with critical notes) and English Translation of a selection from the Letters . 262

BRIEF NOTES ON DATE AND SUBJECT MATTER . 332

BIBLIOGRAPHY 337

ABBREVIATIONS

The text followed throughout is that of S. A. Naber, Leipzig, 1867. Any divergence from this text is recorded in the critical notes.

The following abbreviations of proper names have been employed :

Belt. = Beltrami.
Brak. = Brakman.
Corn. = Cornelissen.
Cross. = Crossley.
Desr. = Desrousseaux.
Ehrent. = Ehrenthal.
Euss. = Eussner.
Fröhn. = Fröhner.
Heind. = Heindorf.
Hild. = Hildebrand.
Kiess. = Kiessling.
Kluss. = Klussmann.
Madv. = Madvig.
Mütz. = Mützell.
Nab. = Naber.
Nieb. = Niebuhr.
Nov. = Novák.
Schw. = Schwierczina.
Stud. = Studemund.

ERRATA

On p. 202. l. 21. omit 'C.' ; and on p. 207. last line but one, omit 'D.'

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

Fronto's reputation in antiquity; discovery and publication of the manuscript; various editions and emendations; description of the palimpsest; loss of Fronto's speeches; Fronto's life.

THERE is no more striking phenomenon in the history of taste than the transitoriness of great reputations. Nevertheless rarely, if ever, has the tide turned so decidedly as in the case of Marcus Cornelius Fronto, who ranked until the beginning of the last century with the greatest names in Roman literature, and who is to-day a nonentity, remembered, if he is remembered at all, merely for his connection with his famous pupil, the Emperor Marcus Aurelius. Even the more enlightened hardly know more of him than that he presumed to criticise the vocabulary of Cicero. Such is the fate of one who was himself hailed by a fourth century admirer, Eumenius, as a second Cicero: "Fronto, Romanae eloquentiae non secundum sed alterum decus[1]."

And in Fronto's case the tragedy of a shattered reputation is further accentuated by its cause; for it was not the mere caprice of men nor the fluctuations of

[1] Eumen. *Panegy. Constant.* 14.

taste which robbed him of his halo, but the discovery and publication of a portion of his own correspondence. Until the early years of the nineteenth century all that men possessed of the orator's works consisted in a few brief fragments, quoted in Charisius, in Servius' commentary on Vergil, in Minucius Felix and Fulgentius Planciades. It was not on these that his reputation rested, but on the complimentary allusions to him in Latin authors and grammarians and on the testimony of his illustrious pupil, who assigns him a place among those to whom he is indebted for counsel and help[1]. The ancient world, indeed, had nothing but praises to shower upon him. Macrobius commended his style for its *siccitas*[2], Claudianus Mamertus for its *pompa*[3]; while Aulus Gellius presents him as the centre of an admiring circle of *litterati*[4], and Sidonius Apollinaris as the founder of a sect which bore his name[5].

It was not until 1815 that Cardinal Angelo Mai, who was at that time an official at the Ambrosian Library at Milan, discovered a palimpsest containing, beneath the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, portions of the correspondence of Fronto. Intense excitement prevailed at

[1] *Meditations* I. 11.

[2] Macrob. *Saturn.* v. 1. E. Droz (*de M. C. Frontonis institutione oratoria*, Besançon, 1885, pp. 19 f.) finds it difficult to reconcile this with such fragments of Fronto's oratory as we possess, e.g. the letter on the inheritance of Matidia (*Ep. ad Caes.* I. 6). But the fragments are really too scanty for us to judge Fronto's oratorical style by them.

[3] Claud. Mamert. *Ep. ad Sepandum.* Miscell. ed. Paris. VI. p. 535.

[4] Gell. II. 26, XIII. 28, XIX. 8, 10, 13.

[5] Sid. Ap. *Ep.* I. 1 (of the *Frontoniani*); cf. Fronto, p. 95 ("nostrae sectae"). As evidence of this influence of the Frontonian school cf. Sid. Ap. *loc. cit.*, where the Ciceronian style is referred to as "veternosum dicendi genus."

the news, for it was confidently expected that these letters would illumine the age of Marcus Aurelius as those of Pliny had illumined the preceding generation. But never were such high hopes doomed to such bitter disappointment. Not only was the palimpsest exceedingly difficult to decipher (so that Mai's edition[1], published at Milan in 1815, left much to be desired), but the tone of the correspondence is strictly personal, so that it does not by any means throw the desired light upon the politics and social life of the time. "On se faisait d'avance une trop belle idée de ces lettres d'un grand empereur à un orateur illustre," says Boissier[2]. Germany felt that she had been deceived by this Fronto, "in turn a querulous invalid and a teacher of empty rhetoric," who, instead of writing to his friends a handbook to the topography and customs of the Rome of his day, dared to write natural, friendly letters, redolent (to quote Walter Pater's description) "of the long-buried fragrance of this famous friendship of the ancient world, where the writers exchange their evening thoughts on their children, the art of speech, the subtleties of 'rhetorical images,' on health and sleep." According to Westermann, the only comfort which the situation afforded was the reflection that there was no longer any need to regret the loss of Fronto's other writings.

[1] There is a copy of this edition in the Cambridge University Library, bearing in Mai's autograph the words "Frontonis in charta caerulea tria tantummodo exemplaria impressa sunt." It is clearly printed, on a thick, blue-gray paper, with wide margins, and contains, in addition to the Ambrosian portion of the palimpsest, the *de differentiis verborum* and the *Exempla elocutionum* (falsely attributed to Fronto), a Latin preface, a facsimile of a page of the MS., and the passages of the *Noctes Atticae* of Aulus Gellius in which Fronto is mentioned.

[2] Gaston Boissier, "La Jeunesse de Marc-Aurèle," in *Rev. d. d. Mondes*, April 1868. Vol. LXXIV. p. 672.

Nevertheless three famous scholars, Niebuhr, Buttmann and Heindorf, determined to give Fronto to the world in an intelligible form. Further than this their hopes did not soar; but they felt that, just as everything in a house should be neat and orderly, so even the *Capite Censi* (as opposed to the *Classici*) among the ancients should be presented to the public in a neat and tidy garb[1]. The simile is hardly "sympathetic"; indeed, one may question whether any author has been so unfortunate in his editors as the hapless Fronto. In 1816 the octavo edition of the German triumvirate appeared—a more careful and scholarly, but less elegant, volume than Mai's edition.

Before the completion of his own edition, Mai was appointed Librarian of the Vatican, and betook himself to Rome, leaving the task of deciphering the remainder of the palimpsest to a subordinate. In the Vatican Library, by a rare freak of fortune, he found another portion of the same palimpsest, containing further letters of Fronto and his friends. He re-edited the whole and published in 1823 the Roman edition, with a dedication to Pope Pius VII.[2], and in 1832 published at Zell an octavo edition of the Vatican portion only, to form a supplement to Niebuhr's edition, for the benefit of Germany. In the 1823 edition Mai incorporated many of Niebuhr's conjectures upon the Ambrosian portion of the palimpsest, giving them as manuscript readings—a

[1] Introduction to Niebuhr's edition, p. viii.

[2] This edition also contains the *de differentiis verborum* and the *Exempla elocutionum*, a Latin preface and Latin notes, and a facsimile of a page of the palimpsest. It is beautifully printed, on thick paper, with wide margins.

proceeding at which Germany was again, and not unnaturally, stirred to wrath. In fact it is difficult to say whether Fronto or his first editor has received harsher treatment from the scholars of that country[1]. Of all who have written on Fronto since 1815, in England, France, Germany, Italy and America, there are few who have a single word of commendation for him. Professor Robinson Ellis[2], Mr Hastings Crossley[3], and M. Boissier[4] have done most for his reputation; while Professor Gildersleeve[5] stands up for him, as he admits, "perhaps out of sheer contrariness." But the Germans, from Niebuhr to Schanz, are almost unanimous in condemnation; Fröhner[6] alone says: "Ich gehöre zu denen die seinen Briefwechsel für einen kostbarsten und unentbehrlichsten Reste der antiken Litteratur halten."

To return to the subsequent history of the text. In 1830 Armand Cassan published in Paris an edition with notes and a French translation—the only complete translation of Fronto which has ever appeared. This

[1] Cf. Niebuhr's introduction, *passim*. He speaks of Fronto's "flosculos et imagines et inanes tinnitus," and calls him "levem et indisertum et saepenumero putide delirantem."

[2] Cf. Prof. Robinson Ellis, A Lecture on *the Correspondence of Fronto and Marcus Aurelius* given in Oxford in Dec. 1903, and published in 1904.

[3] Cf. Hastings Crossley, Appendix to his edition of the *Meditations*, Book iv.

[4] Cf. Gaston Boissier, *La Jeunesse de Marc-Aurèle*, *sup. cit.*

[5] Cf. Prof. Gildersleeve's review of Prof. Ellis in the *American Journal of Philology*, 1904.

[6] Cf. W. Fröhner, in *Philologus*, Suppl. Vol. v. 1889, pp. 49—52. It is a relief to come across the little book of selections published in 1824 by one J. D. McQuige, who can speak with reverence of "the learned and indefatigable Monsignore Mai," and defends Fronto on the ground that "even if he had had talents equal to those of Cicero, he could not have shown them to advantage in that age."

edition, a copy of which is in the British Museum, is of singularly little value. From time to time individual passages were emended by various critics[1], but nothing of great importance was done until 1858, when the Dutch scholar Du Rieu made a fresh collation of the manuscript and rearranged the whole. The results of his investigations were embodied, along with other emendations (including those of Eckstein and Haupt), in Samuel Naber's Leipzig edition of 1867, which still remains the only adequate basis for studying the letters[2]. Naber is not enthusiastic about his task. In fact he apologises for wasting so many months on such a *fatuus* as Fronto, and warns us not to be ensnared "Frontonis elegantiis et orationis putido ornatu." The *Emendationes Frontonianae* of Rudolf Klussmann, with the *Epistula critica* appended thereto by W. Studemund, published in 1874, are of the greatest service in throwing light upon many dark places in Naber's text; and further help was given by Professor Robinson Ellis's article in the first volume of the *Journal of Philology.* In 1902 the Dutch scholar Brakman published the results of a fresh examination of the palimpsest—an examination which Dr Edmund Hauler of Vienna (who has himself published several valuable contributions to Frontonian criticism) condemns as hasty and unsatisfactory[3]. Dr Hauler is

[1] Cf. Bibliography.

[2] I cannot agree with Prof. Ellis (*J. of Phil.* I. p. 17) that Naber's edition supplies "all that, with the exception of a facsimile, a careful student of the text can require."

[3] Cf. Dr Edmund Hauler's review of Brakman's *Frontoniana*, in *Zeitschrift f. d. öst. Gymn.* Vol. LIV. 1903 (pp. 32—37); "Herr B. wusste aber offenbar die Wahrheit des alten Σπεῦδε βραδέως und des Hesiodischen πλέον ἥμισυ παντός nicht gehörig zu schätzen."

himself preparing a new edition of the Letters for the Berlin Academy, but I have been unable to ascertain when this much needed work is to appear.

The palimpsest probably belonged to the Bobbio monastery. Mai found it hard to decipher—"pleraeque palimpsesti paginae ad spem magnifica specie, ad fructum nullo exitu,"—and his description is borne out by Klussmann—"latissimus patet arti divinatoriae campus." The Vatican portion, *codex Vaticanus* 5750 *rescriptus*, consists of 106 pages, and contains beneath the writings of the Council of Chalcedon portions of seven ancient authors:

(1) *M. Cornelii Frontonis fragmenta epistularum aliorumque scriptorum.*
(2) and (3) *Ciceronis orationum fragmenta ac scholia Bobiensia.*
(4) *Sermonum Arianorum reliquiae.*
(5) *Orationum Symmachi reliquiae.*
(6) *Saturarum Persii et Juvenalis fragmenta.*
(7) *Commentationes Moesogothicae in Iohannis evangelium particulae.*

A facsimile edition of this Codex was published at Milan in 1906[1].

The Ambrosian portion of the palimpsest contains 282 pages, making with *cod. Vat.* 5750 388 pages in all. Naber believed that the complete text consisted of 680 pages, and that the missing leaves may still be in existence at Rome, Milan, Naples, Verona, Turin or Vienna.

[1] There is a copy of this edition in the Cambridge University Library.

As regards the dates of the various writings the opinions of the various editors differ. The Acts of the Council are in three hands, all belonging to the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century A.D. m^1 and m^2 are in half-uncials, m^3 in Roman half-cursive. The Letters of Fronto are written in uncials, with capitals for the titles, and for the words INCIPIT, EXPL(ICIT), etc. Contractions are rare, and such as do occur are for the most part those used in fourth and fifth century manuscripts, e.g. B. for BUS, Q. for QUE, IMP. for IMPERATOR (in titles), a short line —, after the last letter of a word, for final M or N, and ', similarly, for final -UM. These contractions occur at the end of the line, and in the middle, as well as at the end, of words[1]. Paragraph marks are found at the beginning of the first letter of each book.

Mai assigned the codex to the fourth century A.D., but Niebuhr, who found a resemblance between it and the Florentine Pandects, assigned it to the seventh century. Naber concluded, from the style of the Greek characters and the general similarity to the Vienna Livy, that the writing was sixth century—a view which has the support of Schanz. In the 1906 facsimile edition the codex is assigned to the fifth century, on the ground of resemblance to other fifth century manuscripts[2]. The simple system of contractions which is employed certainly suggests that the codex is earlier than the sixth century. A short time after it was written, the manuscript was read and

[1] e.g. p. 7, l. 16, p. 37, l. 14, p. 14, l. 16. Cf. Stud. *op. cit.*, p. viii, note 1, and Nab. Pref., p. xii.

[2] Cf. the *Codex Vercellensis Evangeliorum* and the *fragmenta Evangeliorum Weingartensia* (now *Fuldensia*). The editor of the 1906 edition denies that the codex bears any resemblance to the Florentine Pandects.

corrected by an unknown Caecilius[1], whose name Mai was able to read, though it has since vanished. In addition to the corrections, which are written in half-uncials, Caecilius has written out in the top and bottom margins certain passages which he apparently considered worthy of special note. These *lemmata* are written in a rather sloping, half-cursive hand. The Greek letters were apparently written by a Latin scribe, for he occasionally lapses into the Roman character[2].

The central point of the correspondence (which is not arranged on any chronological principle) is the Imperial court. Letters to other friends are comparatively few, and their answers seldom preserved. The correspondence comprises:

ad M. Caesarem libri v.
ad M. Antoninum Imperatorem libri ii.
ad L. Verum Imp. libri ii.
de Eloquentia.
de Orationibus.
ad Ant. Pium liber i.
ad Amicos libri ii.
Principia Historiae.

[1] Cf. p. 57 (*ad Caes.* III. fin.). Naber reads: "Caecilius s(ae)pe (r)ogatus legi emendavi." But L. Havet (*Rev. de Phil.* 1886, p. 189) emends to "Caecilius pr(aefectus) pr(aetorii) r(ogatus) legi emendavi," by analogy with other manuscripts in which the name of the reviser is accompanied by some title. The definite title which Havet suggests gives point to the words "legi emendavi qui supra" (Naber, p. 76, 155, 162, 189, 210, 222, 238), which, if we retain the vague "saepe rogatus" of Naber, are meaningless.

[2] Cf. Klussmann's *Emendationes Frontonianae*, App. p. xxxiii, note 1, cf. p. 30. 15 *dia*, p. 105. 2 *χρηζω*, cf. p. 10. 15, p. 249. 21, p. 244. 4, p. 250. 8, p. 242. 19, etc. Naber tacitly corrects Greek mis-spellings in his edition.

Laudes Fumi et Pulveris.
Laudes Neglegentiae.
de Bello Parthico.
de Feriis Alsiensibus.
de Nepote amisso.
Arion.
Epistulae Graecae.
Gratiarum actionis pro Carthaginiensibus fragmentum.
Fragmenta miscella.

The treatise *de nominum verborumque differentiis* and the *Exempla elocutionum* of Arusianus, which have been falsely ascribed to Fronto, are omitted in Naber's text.

No criticism of Fronto can be fair and reasonable which does not recognize at the outset that these letters cannot of themselves suffice to give us an adequate means of judging the writer's position in literature. It was as an orator that Fronto was distinguished, and it was as an orator that he was selected by Macrobius as the supreme type of the dry style. That it is possible to reconstruct from the letters Fronto's theory of style and the significance of his revival, I hope to show; but that we have absolutely no means of judging at first hand with what success Fronto worked out that theory in the field of oratory is a fact often ignored by those who, having first misunderstood his theory, have sought to refute the express statements of his contemporaries and immediate followers as to the success of its application. We do not possess a single specimen of Fronto's oratory by which to gauge his talents. A few references in the Letters, a few titles of speeches, and a brief paragraph from the speech for the Carthaginians, are all that actually remain to us,

although we hear of Panegyrics of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, of speeches of thanks in the Senate (at the beginning of Fronto's consulship and on behalf of the Carthaginians in 153), of speeches in defence of the Bithynians, the Ptolemaeenses, the Nucerini, and various friends, and of attacks upon Pelops (his masterpiece, according to Sidonius[1]), upon Herodes Atticus and upon the Christians[2].

Of Fronto's life we know few details. He was born at Cirta, in North Africa, probably between 100 and 110 A.D., and certainly before 113 A.D., for he was a senator under Hadrian and must therefore have been a quaestor before 138. At various times he lived in Athens and in Alexandria, but most of his life seems to have been spent in Rome, where he was consul for two months in 143, and where he held the post of Latin tutor to Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. The date of his death is uncertain. Teuffel, on the evidence of a reference in one of the letters to coins bearing the name of Commodus[3], puts it after 175 A.D., since before that date no coins were struck with the name of Marcus Aurelius' son and successor. But Commodus was one of the names of Lucius Verus, and, as we have no letters after 166, it seems more probable that Fronto died soon after that date, and at any rate before the death of Verus himself in 169[4]. Fronto writes to Verus during the Parthian campaign as an old man who feels the end is near[5], and the *de nepote amisso*

[1] Cf. Sid. *Ep.* VII. 10. [2] Cf. Min. Fel. *Octav.* 9 and 31.

[3] p. 161. [4] Cf. Brakman, *Frontoniana*, Vol. II. p. 42.

[5] Cf. *ad Ver. Imp.* II. 4, p. 132, "quamquam me diu cum ista valetudine vivere iampridem pigeat taedeatque, tamen ubi te tanta gloria per virtutem parta reducem videro, neque incassum vixero neque invitus, quantum vitae dabitur, vivam."

is written in the same strain[1]. We know, too, that he was never strong. Mommsen[2], however, upholds the view of Teuffel, and assigns Fronto's death to about the same time as that of Marcus Aurelius, i.e. 180 A.D.

[1] Cf. pp. 235 ff. "me autem consolatur aetas mea prope iam edita et morti proxima....nullum in longo vitae meae spatio a me admissum quod dedecori...foret," etc. Cf. p. 88.

[2] Th. Mommsen, *Die Chronologie der Briefe Frontos*, in *Hermes* VIII. 1874.

CHAPTER II.

THE AGE.

"Non tamen adeo virtutum sterile saeculum ut non bona exempla prodiderit." TACITUS, *Hist.* I. 3.

THE decline of a great literature is no sudden, inexplicable phenomenon, nor is it to be lightly ascribed to the pernicious influence of one particular school. Abrupt as the termination of Roman literature appears, we may discern the causes which inevitably led to it no less surely than we may track, step by step, the causes which led to the fall of the Empire itself. Indeed, as we shall see, many of the same causes operated in the destruction of the lesser, as in that of the greater, organism.

Here and there, in the pages of the younger Pliny and of Seneca, we find hints, casual phrases, which point to the fact that the writers of the Silver Age were conscious that literature was on the wane, though they would not admit it. "Cessat omne studium et liberalia professi sine ulla frequentia desertis angulis praesident[1]." "De illis nemo dubitabit quin operose nihil agant, qui litterarum inutilium studiis detinentur, quae iam apud Romanos quoque magna manus est[2]." Thus does Seneca betray

[1] Sen. *Ep.* XCV. 23.

[2] Sen. *de Brev. Vit.* XIII. 1.

himself. And it is Pliny who, for all his championship of the age in which he lived—("I am one of those," he says, "who admire the ancients, yet without underrating, as some others do, certain instances of genius which our own times afford[1]")—it is Pliny who lets out the whole secret when he describes Titinius Capito as "ipsarum denique litterarum iam senescentium reductor ac reformator[2]." Indeed it has been suggested that the very energy of criticism of the Dialogue of Tacitus and the Letters of Pliny is due to a dim consciousness of waning force, and that it is the realisation of its powerlessness which alternately tames into acquiescence or galls into hysterical effort the literature of this age.

A considerable portion of the Dialogue of Tacitus deals with the various reasons suggested for the decay of oratory in the speakers' time. It is curious that the solution which Messalla offers of the problem is exactly that offered in the treatise "On the Sublime[3]," to explain a similar phenomenon in Greek literature—namely, the decay of national life. "A great style," says Maternus, "like a fire, requires fuel to sustain it, motion to arouse it, activity to strengthen it[4]." The conditions of life seemed to him too commonplace and peaceful to stimulate oratory. "Postquam bellatum apud Actium," wrote Tacitus, "atque omnem potestatem ad unum conferri pacis interfuit, magna illa ingenia cessere[5]"; or again, "eloquentiam Augustus

[1] Plin. *Ep.* VI. 21. 1, "sum ego is, qui mirer antiquos, non tamen ut quidam temporum nostrorum ingenia despicio. Neque enim quasi lassa et effeta natura nihil iam laudabile parit."

[2] Plin. *Ep.* VIII. 12. 1, cf. VIII. 14. 9 where Pliny calls his age *hebetata, fracta, contusa.*

[3] Longinus, *περὶ ὕψους*, ch. 44.

[4] Tac. *Dial.* ch. 36.

[5] Tac. *Hist.* I. 1.

sicut omnia pacaverat[1]." "Pacifier l'éloquence," wrote Boissier, "c'est l'éteindre."

It is not, perhaps, the actual loss of political freedom which kills literary production; Rome under Augustus, the Rome of the Golden Age, was hardly "free," and the same is true of sixteenth century Italy, or of seventeenth century France. It is rather that in the course of time loss of freedom almost invariably means loss of manhood[2], and literature always decays with a decaying people[3], not only from the want of the genius which creates, but also from the absence of the taste that appreciates and the atmosphere that stimulates to high endeavour. "The memorable ages of literature, in Greece or Rome, in France or England, have been the ages of a literary society[4]." Yet the loss of political freedom was felt in a peculiar degree in a literature which from its earliest times was so essentially political that its fate must needs be closely bound up with that of the State. For Latin literature was the creation of men who (with the exception of Catullus) were citizens before they were artists, and when the citizen became a subject literature lost its soul. It fell with the Empire which it had helped to establish and only revived under the inspiration of that new

[1] Tac. *Dial.* 38.

[2] Cf. Constant Martha, *Mélanges de littérature ancienne*, pp. 212 ff. (*Auguste et les lettres*): "Sous les plus belles apparences se cache un principe de mort. Ce n'est pas impunément qu'un peuple renonce à la liberté politique. Avec elle disparût à Rome l'ambition généreuse, l'activité civique....Pour ne parler que de littérature, la décadence commence déjà sous ce règne....On sent que l'âme romaine a perdu son ressort. Rome avait, au prix de liberté, acheté le repos."

[3] Cf. Sen. *Ep.* CXIV. 10, "ubicunque videris orationem corruptam placere, ibi mores quoque a recto descivisse non erit dubium."

[4] Walter Raleigh, *Style*, p. 73.

patriotism—the patriotism of the citizens of the "City of God[1]."

For the Roman people in the second century A.D. were unquestionably a decaying people[2]. We see it not only in literature but in art, no longer the handmaid of a people's faith, but a slave to the whims of a few rich patrons. Rome herself no longer set the standard of literary taste, for the literary organism kept pace with the breaking up of the political system, and, while the central point of literary, as of political, life was nominally Rome, the best of Rome was in the provinces. Rome no longer had the power of drawing all literary talent to herself and stamping her impress upon it. She was very splendid under the Antonines, but she was becoming less and less Roman. Her wars were great, no doubt, but they were not the wars which touch the heart and kindle the imagination[3]. State and religion, too, were mere forms, and it was only in Law that Rome could express her true self. As Goethe said of German literature in the eighteenth century—"Nicht die Talente hätten gefehlt, sondern es sei der Mangel an einen lebendigen Stoff gewesen." It was this want of great subjects and noble themes which in part drove men back to the past in that archaizing movement with which we shall deal in another chapter. "The age," said Nettleship, "has no vigour of its own, but builds the sepulchres

[1] Cf. Gustave Michaut, *Le génie latin*, ch. 1.

[2] Cf. G. Bernhardy, *Grundiss der rom. Lit.* p. 317. He declares that the keynote to the century is simply "ein entschiedener Mangel an Genie und selbstständiger Kraft." Teuffel characterises the age by "its self-important fussiness without serious aim,...its complete want of individual taste and creative power, judgment and discrimination, its erudition and its pedantry."

[3] It is remarkable that in all the century from Suetonius to Marius Maximus there is no history in the Latin tongue, and no great poet.

of the prophets and waits for inspiration to rise from their dust[1]."

In his *Rome sous Trajan*, M. Pellisson finds yet another reason which may have contributed to the decay of literature, and especially of oratory, in the fact that the age was one of transition, in which the men who could interpret it had not realised its meaning, and the men who had dimly realised its meaning were busy building up the Empire by deeds and had no time to glorify it in words[2]. " L'aristocratie lettrée s'entêta dans son antipathie pour l'empire et lui fit de l'opposition en conspirant ou en boudant. Elle tourna le dos au présent et à l'avenir, et obstinément fixa ses regards sur le passé. Ainsi d'une part, des hommes d'affaires qui ne furent que des hommes d'affaires; de l'autre côté, des lettrés, qui ne furent que des lettrés; ici la matière informe, là la forme vide. Dans aucun camp, il n'y eût place pour la vraie éloquence[3]." It all comes back to the old difficulty—the divorce of literature from life.

In no branch of literature was the decay of civic life so deeply felt as in oratory[4]. Indeed, the concentration of power in the hands of one man changed the whole conditions of oratory. Not only were cases in the law-courts decided by the interrogation of witnesses and the examination of evidence, but, when the interests and passions of public life failed men as subjects for declamation, they

[1] H. Nettleship, *Lectures and Essays on Latin Literature*, Vol. I., p. 276 (on Aulus Gellius).

[2] M. Pellisson combats the view that great themes were wanting for political and judicial eloquence. Cf. *op. cit.* pp. 198 ff.

[3] *Rome sous Trajan*, p. 201.

[4] For the difference between oratory under the Republic and under the Empire cf. G. Boissier, *L'opposition sous les Césars*, pp. 193 ff.

had recourse to fictitious themes, and so there grew up "cette déclamation à vide et ce parlage éternel qui évite de dire jamais rien." Nor was it eloquence alone which suffered in the process; she dragged poetry with her in her fall, and, by borrowing for her unreal, romantic subjects the ornaments of poetical diction, broke down the natural barriers between prose and poetry, with the result that we have on the one hand the poetical prose of Tacitus and Apuleius, and on the other the prosaic poetry of Lucan, with its strong rhetorical colouring[1]. It was this rhetorical declamation which was responsible for much of the extravagance and bad taste of the age, since, when everything has been said before, the only way to catch the attention of a jaded public is to say it again in different and more exaggerated and paradoxical words. Little by little a narrow training in rhetoric was taking the place of the wide Ciceronian culture[2].

Tacitus and Quintilian both sought the remedy in educational reform—and at first sight it might seem that their campaign succeeded, for the age of the Antonines was one of great literary activity. It abounded in libraries and schools and authors; public recitations, travelling lectureships and a flourishing book-trade testify to the diffusion of a certain type of education and culture[3].

[1] Quint. x. 1. 90: "Lucanus...magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus."

[2] Cf. Tac. *Dial.* 33: "differentiam nostrae desidiae et inscitiae adversus acerrima et fecundissima eorum studia."

Cf. *ib.* 20: "quis enim ignorat et eloquentiam et ceteras artes descivisse ab illa vetere gloria non inopia hominum sed desidia iuventutis et neglegentia parentum et inscientia praecipientium et oblivione moris antiqui?"

[3] Aulus Gellius testifies on every page to the great interest taken in his day in etymology and in every form of grammatical and linguistic

Nevertheless a mania for scribbling went hand in hand with an erudition that often lapsed into triviality, and the contrast between the zeal for culture and the barrenness of original production even suggests that as education spread the results almost inevitably became stereotyped.

But the cessation of original production may be ascribed rather to the defects than to the diffusion of the educational system—a system whereby rhetoric supplanted instead of leading up to eloquence; partly, too, to the growing tendency to sever literature from life and to the withdrawal of literary men into a separate class; and partly to that natural process of decay which comes not only to individuals but to nations, and, it would seem, to literatures. "Do they merely depend," asks W. H. Warren, "upon the life of the society to which they belong, or have they in themselves a limit, a curve, a parabola, which they must trace, an inevitable life-history of growth, of blossoming, and decay; or again, are there cycles or recurring seasons in their life, by which attempt passes into creation, creation into criticism, and a dissipation or suspension of forces must precede new productivity[1]?" It is this view which Cicero himself foreshadowed in the case of oratory[2], and which Velleius Paterculus develops in the familiar words: "Alit aemulatio ingenia, et nunc

study, and to the wide reading of his circle of friends. Cf. *ib.* v. 21. 2, where we find a man of affairs ("doctrina seria...ac nihil de verbis laborante") so thoroughly steeped in ancient literature as to be able to justify his use of *pluria* by quotations from six old Latin authors. Cf. also I. 18, X. 5, XII. 14, XIII. 10. 4, etc., etc.

[1] W. H. Warren, Introduction to Brownrigg's *Latin Prose of the Silver Age*, p. xxiv.

[2] Cic. *Tusc.* II. 5: "atque oratorum quidem laus ita ducta ab humili venit ad summum, ut iam, quod natura fit in omnibus fere rebus, senescat, brevique tempore ad nihilum ventura videatur."

invidia, nunc admiratio imitationem accendit, naturaque quod summo studio petitum est, ascendit in summum, difficilisque in perfecto mora est, naturaliterque quod procedere non potest, recedit[1]." For, since imitation is a natural instinct (an instinct stronger, perhaps, in the Romans than in any other nation), a great creative age is almost invariably succeeded by an age of dilettantism. A certain command over metre was the inheritance of all who came after Vergil, and beguiled by the "grand style" of the Augustans and the apparent ease with which it could be reproduced, men rushed headlong into verse-writing. The craze had begun already in Horace's day[2], and with the decay of civic life and the dearth of public interests dilettantism grew apace. The younger Pliny shows us a society in which letters have become for many, himself included, the chief business of life[3]. Hadrian[4] himself was a typical dilettante, and even Marcus Aurelius, when not engaged in the duties of administration or surrendering himself to the charms of philosophy, wrote Greek and Latin, verse and prose. "The brilliancy of inherited phrase,—of Ciceronian prose as of Vergilian poetry,—concealed the poverty of the literary amateur's fancy from himself." The grand style, as Sir Samuel Dill says, was "such a perfect instrument, it was so protean in its various power, it was so abundant in its resources, that a man of third-rate power and thin, commonplace imagination, who had been trained in the skilful manipulation of

[1] Vell. Pat. I. 17.

[2] Cf. Hor. *A. P.* 382: "qui nescit versus tamen audet fingere. quidni?"

[3] Cf. Plin. *Ep.* VIII. 19, etc.

[4] Cf. Tert. *Apol.* 5, "Hadrianus omnium curiositatum explorator."

consecrated phrase, might for the moment delude himself and his friends by faint echoes of the music of the Golden Age[1]." "Quemadmodum omnium rerum, sic litterarum quoque intemperantia laboramus," wrote Seneca[2]. Yet all this activity did not spell growth and progress but rather decay. "Nihil crescit sola imitatione[3]."

Nor were external circumstances any more favourable to literary production. Patronage had struck at the very roots of literature, and although there were great writers after Augustus, since "genius cannot be blasted by the favour of a court[4]," we see already in Ovid the beginning of the end; indeed, the affectation and bad taste which inevitably accompany servility are far more repulsive in the *Tristia* than in anything Fronto has written. Further, in addition to the evils of patronage, there was the restraint exercised by the principate itself. The Antonines attempted to reconcile the Empire with liberty—"res olim dissociabiles, principatum et libertatem[5]"; but the attempt was foredoomed to failure, and the despotism of the principate took from men not only the power to say what they thought, but the power to see and think aright. The direct influence of the principate on literature has often been exaggerated. The production of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, for instance, with its strange medley of daring

[1] S. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, p. 170. It must not be forgotten, in estimating the charm which the "grand style" exercised, that we are dealing here with a southern people, who felt to the full the music of mere words.

[2] Sen. *Ep.* cvi. 12.

[3] Quint. x. 2. 8.

[4] J. P. Postgate, *Selections from Propertius*, Introd. p. lxxxi. "As a literature Latin began to die from the time that it began to be patronised." For the effect of patronage on literature, cf. Juv. vii. inc.

[5] Tac. *Agric.* 3, cf. *Med.* i. 14: "A kingly government which respects most of all the freedom of the governed."

republicanism and imperial flattery, suggests that it was not so oppressive as it has been represented. Indeed it seems to have affected to any considerable extent only satire, recent history, and political and judicial oratory. Unquestionably it was the indirect effect of the principate, of which we have already spoken, which was infinitely the greater evil, involving as it did the deadening of moral and intellectual enthusiasm, the waning of the sense of power, and the degradation of Roman character[1].

Then, again, the decay of agriculture and the flocking of the people to the towns meant degeneration, moral and physical; free doles of food and money sapped men's independence; over-taxation produced a grinding poverty which was in striking contrast to the luxury of the upper classes. In addition to this there came, after the Antonines, anarchy, a panic fear, spreading right over the Roman Empire, at the breaking down of the barriers which had protected them so long, disastrous wars, and the scourge of the plague, which destroyed the last remaining families of the old Roman stock. Small wonder that the claims of an over-grown empire[2], exposed to internal dissension, barbarian inroads and pestilence, left little room for literary production in the age which followed the Antonine epoch.

Literature was dying, then, from internal causes, and external conditions were not the primary cause of its end. Nevertheless they undoubtedly hastened on that end, so that the curtain falls with a suddenness which seems at

[1] Cf. H. E. Butler, *Post-Augustan Poetry*, ch. 1. *Vid. sup.*

[2] It is a curious fact that literature and art seem to flourish best in small states, such as Athens and Florence; in Elizabethan rather than in Victorian England.

first sight unaccountable. And in the reckoning up of those forces which were directed against literature in the age which succeeded Fronto, we must include the opposition of philosophy, ever at war with rhetoric and defying aesthetic culture, and the hostility of a considerable section of the Christian Church, which regarded pagan literature as unnecessary or pernicious and the pursuit of style a device of the powers of darkness. It was a hostility often by no means blind to the charms of the culture against which it fought—the hostility of a Tertullian[1], who loved pagan rhetoric to the day of his death, though he strove to resist its spell, or the hostility of a Jerome[2], to whom it seemed impossible that a man could be simultaneously a Ciceronian and a Christian. It was in the hands of the Christian Church that literature lived again, but it was a literature no longer Roman, no longer national, but Christian.

With two further internal causes which have been

[1] Cf. Tert. *idol.* 18, "doctrinam saecularis litteraturae et stultitiae apud Deum deputatam aspernamur." Cf. *ib.* 8. Tertullian claimed that the Christian Church could hold its own in the field of literature. Cf. *de Spect.* 29, "Si scenicae doctrinae delectant, satis nobis litterarum est, satis versuum est, satis sententiarum, satis etiam canticorum, satis vocum, nec fabulae, sed veritates..." He maintained also that a knowledge of pagan literature was essential in order to convict the heathen out of their own mouth. Cf. *de coron.* 7: "litterae ad hoc saeculares necessariae; de suis enim instrumentis saecularia probari necesse est."

[2] Cf. Jerome *Ep.* 22 and 30. Cf. also the attitude of Gregory the Great (*Pref. Job* 1. 6, *Ep. Missoria*, ch. 5): "Non metacismi collisionem fugio, non barbarismi confusionem devito...situs motusque praepositionum casusque servare contemno, quia indignum vehementer existimo, ut verba caelestis oraculi restringam sub regulis Donati." We might apply Porphyry's words about Plotinus to many of the Christian writers: *ἔγραφεν οὔτε εἰς κάλλος ἀποτυπούμενος τὰ γράμματα οὔτε εὐσήμως τὰς συλλαβὰς διαιρῶν οὔτε τῆς ὀρθογραφίας φρονίζων, ἀλλὰ μόνου τοῦ νοῦ ἐχόμενος.*

advanced as accounting for the end of Roman literature we must deal in greater detail, as directly affecting the reputation of Fronto. The one, the archaistic movement, was undoubtedly fostered and systematised by him, though he did not originate it. The fact that this movement, as Fronto understood and upheld it, aimed at the infusion of new vitality into the Latin language and literature, and that, ultimately, by the creation and development of the *Elocutio novella* that aim was realised, has been too often ignored. It is true that for the moment, by turning men away from classical models and thus breaking the thread of continuity, the archaists hastened the end of the Roman literature of their day[1]; but that literature already bore within itself the seeds of death, and it was the very movement which was the last instrument in its destruction which was to breathe into it new life. The other force which acted to destroy Roman literature was the mania for the Greek language and learning, which threatened to supplant Latin—a movement fostered by Hadrian and characteristic of the Antonine age. This movement Fronto, far from encouraging, consistently opposed, with a far-sighted grasp of its significance in which he seems to have stood almost alone.

[1] Cf. J. W. Mackail, *Latin Literature*, p. 286 (of Fronto): "His reversion to the style and language of pre-Ciceronian times was only a temporary fashion; but in the general decay of taste and learning it was sufficient to break the continuity of Latin literature. The collapse of the imperial system after the death of Marcus Aurelius is not more striking and complete than the collapse of literature after that of his tutor."

CHAPTER III.

ARCHAISM.

"Multa renascentur quae iam cecidere."

HORACE, *Ars Poetica* 70.

"Reverenda vetustas."

GELL. XVIII. 5. 11.

THE movements towards archaism and Graecism run to some extent together, for the archaistic tendency was unquestionably fostered by the influence of contemporary Greek Atticists[1]. Maximus of Tyre, Aelius Aristides and other Greek sophists of the time of Fronto and Apuleius employed old Attic words to tickle the ears of their audience[2]. Arrian, too, wrote his *Indica* in the obsolete Ionic dialect, and in the time of Hadrian the archaistic tendency in Greek art[3] was most manifest, as it is also in Greek inscriptions of this epoch[4]. Nevertheless, although it was encouraged by contemporary Greek

[1] On archaism and Atticism in Greek literature of this period see E. Norden, *Kunstprosa*, pp. 357 ff. He emphasizes the influence which the Atticist reaction must have exercised upon Rome. We know that Fronto himself knew Herodes Atticus and had heard Polemo declaim (p. 29). For the Atticism of Fronto's own Greek, *vid.* ch. IV. p. 36.

[2] Cf. Lucian, *Rhet. doct.* 17. Cf. also Lucian, *Lexiphanes*, *pass.*

[3] Cf. Baumeister, *Denkmäler*, p. 248.

[4] Cf. Meisterhans, *Grammatik der Att. Inscr.* p. 222.

Atticism, it was not there that the Latin archaistic movement originated. Rather it was a tendency which had long been growing within Roman literature itself, a tendency only to be expected in a literature of which it is supremely true that "exempla trahunt," and in a nation whose respect for *auctoritas* was a natural instinct. For, as Sittl has pointed out, the relations to the past as regarded *auctoritas* became more complicated with the dawn of a new literary era, which could look back not only upon Ennius and Plautus, but upon Cicero and Vergil[1]. The struggle between old and new took various forms, and the opposition to the classicism of the Ciceronians led on the one side to archaism, and on the other to the introduction of popular forms into literature. Both are reactions against the excessive purism of Cicero and Caesar; and in Fronto, and to a still greater extent in Apuleius, the two tendencies run side by side[2]. Indeed, vulgarism and archaism could not but overlap, in view of the large proportion of vulgarisms in the archaic vocabulary, in the days when the gulf between the written and the spoken language was not so firmly fixed; and it is precisely the confusion between archaism and vulgarism[3] which has done so much to complicate the question of *Africitas*.

[1] Cf. Karl Sittl, *Jahresbericht* 68, 1891, p. 231: "Für die Epigonen kamen nun ausser den archaischen Klassikern Cicero und Vergil mit ihren Zeitgenossen in Betracht....Einen Gegensatz zwischen jenen und diesen konstruieren zu wollen, als ob mit Fronto eine Periode des Archaismus abgebrochen sei, ist ein Unternehmen das weder durch die literär-historischen Zeugnisse noch durch die Sprache Frontos und seiner Nachfolger selbst gestürzt wird." Cf. Sittl's article on "Archaismus" in *Commentationes Wölfflinianae*, Leipzig, 1891, pp. 403 ff.

[2] Cf. App. *inf.*

[3] In this connection it is interesting to compare the Chaucerian phrases which survive in spoken American.

The Frontonian school has so often been held solely responsible for the archaistic movement, especially by those critics who have attributed to that movement the destruction of Roman literature, that it seems worth while, for the sake of Fronto's reputation, to assemble in some detail the internal evidence at our disposal which goes to prove that this tendency had been steadily growing since the days of Sallust, and that, in fact, archaism is no more an episode in the history of philology than in the history of archaeology. That the antiquarian school produced little until Fronto's day is true; by its very nature it tended to be critical rather than creative[1]. Nevertheless the numerous references to archaism and the zeal with which it is denounced prove that it was making its opposition to Ciceronianism and Vergilianism most emphatically felt.

The archaism of Sallust, which consists mainly in imitation of Cato[2], is a byword, and need not detain us. The epigram quoted by Quintilian[3]:

> "Et verba antiqui multum furate Catonis
> Crispe, Iugurthinae conditor historiae,"

is supported by Suetonius[4] and Fronto[5]. That Sallust, like some of the later archaists, was also an innovator is not so often observed. Yet Gellius calls him "nova-

[1] Cf. M. Hertz, *Renaissance und Rococo*, p. 23: "ihrer innersten Natur nach erscheint sie mehr auf die Kritik, auf die Negation angewiesen als auf die Production."

[2] Cato himself was an archaist, and used such archaic words as *tuburchinandus*, *lurchinabundus*. Cf. Quint. I. 6. 42.

[3] Quint. VIII. 3. 29.

[4] Cf. Suet. *Vit. Aug.* 86, and *de ill. gram.* 15.

[5] p. 62: "sectator Catonis."

torem verborum[1]," and speaks of his "verborum fingendi studium[2]."

It was Asinius Pollio who upbraided Sallust for his archaistic leanings; yet he himself fell under the same influence and was full of reminiscences of Pacuvius and Accius[3], which made his style hard and dry, "so that he seemed to belong to the century before Cicero[4]." Cicero himself had to fight against the Atticists[5], Calvus, Brutus, Caelius and the two Asinii, and to defend himself against the critics who were objecting "non erat hoc apud antiquos"; in curious anticipation of the time when Ciceronians were to refuse entrance into their writings to many a good Latin word on the ground that "it is not found in Cicero." Nor was it only the Atticists who preserved the old words—Cicero tells us that the speech of the ladies of his day was coloured by reminiscences of Plautus and Terence[6], and we know that Cato and Ennius still reigned supreme in schoolrooom and theatre in the days of Horace[7], Persius[8] and Aulus Gellius[9].

It is easy for us, to whom the Augustans represent the very flower of Roman literature, to under-estimate the struggle between old and new which had to be fought before the new poetry gained a footing. But one need only read the second book of Horace's *Epistles*[10] and the

[1] Gell. I. 15. [2] Gell. IV. 15.

[3] Cf. Tac. *Dial.* 21. Cf. J. H. Schmalz, *Über den Sprachgebrauch des Asinius Pollio*. Münich, 1890. Cf. also Cic. *ad Fam.* x. 31—33.

[4] Quint. x. 1. 113. [5] Cf. Tac. *Dial.* 22.

[6] Cic. *de orat.* III. 12. 45. Cf. Plin. *Ep.* 1. 16, and Greenough and Kittredge, *Words and their ways in English Speech*, p. 54: "The dialect of women is more conservative than that of men."

[7] Cf. Hor. *Ep.* II. 1. 60 ff., *ib.* 49 ff.

[8] Cf. Pers. *Sat.* III. 44 ff. [9] Cf. Gell. XVII. 5. 7.

[10] Cf. esp. *Ep.* II. 1. 36 ff. and 60 ff.

Ars Poetica[1] to realise how hardly fought that struggle was and how deeply rooted in the Roman mind was the instinct to admire what was old, simply on the ground of its antiquity. Nevertheless the new school triumphed, and with its victory archaism might have been expected to die out. Nothing, however, is further from the facts. Seneca, Quintilian, Persius, Juvenal, Tacitus and Martial all bear witness to its vitality, till it secures imperial patronage under Hadrian, and becomes at last a productive movement under Fronto, Aulus Gellius and Apuleius.

Seneca gives us his views on the subject with great frankness in one of his Letters[2]. Extremes, he thinks, in any direction are to be avoided. Consequently he condemns alike that love of the old which revives obsolete diction and that love of the new which creates new forms, and censures the man "qui modo antiqua verba atque exsoleta revocat ac profert, modo fingit et ignota ac deflectit." For those whose language recalls that of the Twelve Tables he has nothing but scorn; the interesting point is that he admits that they are numerous. "Multi ex alieno saeculo petunt verba, duodecim tabulas loquuntur." His purism, however, does not go so far as that of Caesar, whose advice "Shun every strange and unusual word like a rock[3]" suggests that his literary taste was hardly on a level with his military genius.

[1] Cf. esp. *A. P.* 47 ff. There are archaisms even in Horace and Vergil, for the diction of poetry always tends to be conservative. Cf. *Sat.* II. 7. 57 *altercari*, *Od.* IV. 4. 36 *indecorare*, and old forms like *intumus*, *surrexe*, *formonsus*. Cf. also in Vergil *olli*, *quîs*, *faxo*, *nutribat* (*Aen.* VII. 485).

[2] Sen. *Ep.* CXIV.

[3] Quoted from the *de Analogia* in Gell. I. 10. Seneca permits the occasional use of an uncommon word. Otherwise, he thinks, "in sordes incidunt."

There is ample testimony, again, in the pages of Quintilian to the existence of a strong body of archaists in his day, whose influence he did much to counteract. "Some people," he says, "think the ancients the only people worth reading[1]"; archaism was even established in the law-courts, where advocates puzzled the praetors with old forms[2]. Ardent Ciceronian though he is, Quintilian does not condemn archaism *in toto*. He admits that an archaic word in the right place gives a touch of dignity[3], a certain majesty which is not unpleasing[4]; but he insists that there shall be no affectation, and that the meaning must not be obscured[5]. Archaism in his eyes is too often a mere device for the display of the author's pedantry[6].

Persius alludes to the antiquarianism of his day in the lines:

> "Est nunc Brisaei quem venosus liber Atti,
> Sunt quos Pacuviusque et verrucosa moretur
> Antiopa, aerumnis cor luctificabile fulta[7]";

and it is Juvenal who tells us of the lady learned in grammar:

> "ignotosque mihi tenet antiquaria versus[8]."

Antiquarius was a word coined apparently by Tacitus, whose *Dialogus*[9] is full of the conflict between old and

[1] Quint. x. 1. 43: "quidam solos veteres legendos putant, neque in ullis aliis eloquentiam et robur viris dignum arbitrantur."

[2] Cf. *ib.* II. 5. 21 ff.

[3] Cf. *ib.* VIII. 3. 24 f.

[4] Cf. *ib.* VIII. 2. 12.

[5] Cf. *ib.* I. 6. 39.

[6] Cf. Suet. *Vit. Aug.* 86 (Augustus' criticism of Antonius): "M. quidem Antonium ut insanum increpat, quasi ea scribentem quae mirentur potius homines quam intellegant."

[7] Pers. *Sat.* I. 76 ff.

[8] Juv. *Sat.* VI. 451 ff.

[9] Cf. Tac. *Dial.* 21, 37, 42, etc.

new. "Vetera semper in laude, praesentia in fastidio" is the complaint brought against those who read Lucilius rather than Horace, Lucretius rather than Vergil. Martial likewise bears witness that the struggle was raging in Vespasian's time and that the taste for Ennius[1] was prevalent—a taste which Dill says "was to bear its Dead Sea fruit in the age of the Antonines." Men rarely read their contemporaries[2], complains Martial; it is only the dead poets that are praised[3], the rough, antique work of an Accius or a Pacuvius[4].

From Sallust, then, right down to Martial, we have traced a steady movement towards antiquarianism, a movement whose current had hitherto set underground, but was destined under Hadrian, himself a thoroughgoing archaist[5], to rise to the surface. From this time onward we find the tendency towards the imitation of early writers predominant, and, although not unchallenged[6], supported by all the leading men of letters.

The discussion of Fronto's own archaistic tendencies will be best deferred until we come to investigate his theory of style, of which it forms a part; for, unlike Gellius[7], Fronto was a stylist before he was an antiquary.

[1] Cf. Mart. *Ep.* v. 10: "Ennius est lectus salvo tibi, Roma, Marone."

[2] Cf. *ib.* v. 10. [3] Cf. *ib.* VIII. 69. [4] Cf. *ib.* XI. 90.

[5] Cf. Spart. *vit. Hadr.* 16. 2: "Amavit praeterea genus vetustum dicendi,...Ciceroni Catonem, Vergilio Ennium, Sallustio Caelium praetulit."

[6] Cf. the tone of the critic in Gell. v. 21. 7: "tibi habeas auctoritates ex Faunorum et Aboriginum saeculo repetitas." Cf. also Lucian, *rhet. doct.*, where the young aspirant to eloquence is ironically bidden to have fifteen or twenty little Attic words always at hand, and obscure and outlandish expressions from archaic writers, whereby to impress his audience.

[7] For archaism in Aulus Gellius cf. C. Knapp in *Classical Studies in honour of Henry Drisler*, New York, 1894, pp. 126 ff.

For the present the point which requires to be emphasized is this, that while Fronto did not create this antiquarian movement, it was he who reduced it to a system, and that it was the Frontonian school which first made it creative and productive.

The theory has been propounded by Klotz[1] that archaism is not the opponent of classicism but its natural successor, and that from the dictum "alt ist gut" follows the other dictum "älter ist besser." Klotz urges in support of this view the fact that archaism and classicism are often found in the same author; in Apuleius, for instance, whose *Metamorphoses* are far less Ciceronian than the *Apologia* and the *Florida*; and he maintains that it was simply the γένος which determined the style. The principle "non vulgare loqui[2]," the recoil from the speech of daily life, tended towards the imitation of recognized models, and this tendency, according to Klotz, often went back beyond classicism to archaism.

It is certainly true that the two are not mutually exclusive and that they both have their root in the single principle of *imitatio*; nevertheless they are often sharply opposed. That they are found in the same author is due to the fact, which Klotz has not remarked, that in this period archaism is still what it was in Sallust—an ornament and nothing more. Even in Apuleius and Arnobius it is still a "rhetorisches Hilfsmittel," to be employed only when suitable to theme and style. No one had yet conceived the idea of writing a whole book, or even a single letter, in archaic style and language, as was done in the East in the *Atthis*.

[1] A. Klotz, "Klassicismus und Archaismus" in *Archiv* xv. pp. 401 ff.
[2] Stat. *Silv.* v. 3. 214.

The immediate causes of the Frontonian outburst of archaism are not far to seek. We have dealt already with the decay of literature at Rome, the utter dearth of originality and creative power. The author who cannot create is thrown back on imitation, and here the superiority of less known models is obvious. If originality is really, as Herbert Paul called it, "undetected plagiarism," the archaists were taking the shortest cut towards remedying their natural defects. "En imitant," says Boissier, "on pouvait avoir l'air de créer."

Further, men were weary of imitating the inimitable; or, as Niebuhr prefers to put it, "pravitas saeculi fastidire coeperat eam cui imitandae impar esset recentioris aevi elegantiam." At any rate, it is true, as Velleius Paterculus had said long before, that zeal dies with the death of hope[1], in literature as in every other branch of human effort; and the same instinct which prompted the Romans to take as their models, at the very birth of their literature, the Alexandrians rather than the great poets of Greece, reappears in this reaction against a weary and fruitless Ciceronianism.

Then again, the discontent with the present, which the condition of the Empire fostered, threw men back for comfort upon the better, happier past. Indeed, as we have seen, it was to a false attitude with regard to the past that the death of literature was partly due, and this false attitude expresses itself in a morbid love for the obsolete and a return to the vocabulary and syntax, and even to the orthography, of Republican days. It was a deliberate, albeit desperate, effort to recapture the spirit by recapturing the letter.

[1] Vell. Pat. I. 18: "studium cum spe senescit."

It has been maintained, on the evidence of a passage in Suetonius[1], that the provinces were behind the literary fashion of the capital. It would be nearer the mark to say that they were ahead of the capital, for in this age it was they who led the way in all literary activity, and it was Fronto, Apuleius, Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius and Augustine, Symmachus[2], Sidonius, Mamertus and Ennodius who were the leaders in the archaistic movement.

All branches of literature were affected by the antiquarian spirit: letters, especially through their connection with Old Comedy; history, dealing as it did with olden times; grammatical treatises, where wide reading in old literature was eagerly displayed; poetry which preserved old words by way of decoration; and translations, for which glossaries containing old forms were often the basis. Owing to the spirit of religious conservatism, it reigned supreme in the liturgy, as in religious art, and it was ever cherished by the jurists, in order to maintain the hallowed, traditional character of the Book of the Law. Further, the influence of the archaists in Fronto's day was so great that the archaisms which they use reappear in later writers who did not devote themselves personally to antiquarian research. It is this all-important point which

[1] Suet. *Gram.* 24 (of Valerius Probus): "legerat in provincia quosdam veteres libellos apud grammatistam, durante adhuc ibi antiquorum memoria, necdum omnia abolita sicut Romae."

[2] The archaistic movement was not confined, as has been suggested, to Africa; the four last-mentioned are of Gallic origin or education, and to them we may add the Gallic panegyrists. Cf. esp. Symm. *Ep.* III. 44: "*ἀρχαϊσμὸν* scribendi non invitus adfecto." In Gaul, however, the most ardent archaists (such as Jul. Titianus, mentioned in Sid. *Ep.* I. 1 2) have left no remains.

has been ignored by Wölfflin, Monceaux and other champions of *Africitas*[1], who have explained these unconscious archaisms as survivals in the popular dialect of old forms current in the language of the first African settlers. The influence of Fronto and Arnobius, and still more of Apuleius, is being traced in author after author, and by explaining these "unconscious archaisms" as mere borrowings we are relieved from assenting to a theory the assumption of which involves many grave difficulties.

[1] Cf. *App. inf.*

CHAPTER IV.

GRAECISM.

In addition to archaism there was another tendency at work upon the literature of the age—the Graecizing tendency. With Graecisms as a peculiar feature of African Latin this is not the place to deal in detail[1]. That Greek words and constructions abound in the Letters of Cicero, in Petronius, in the *Bellum Africanum* and the *Bellum Hispanum*, as well as in Fronto, Aulus Gellius and the *Metamorphoses* (the *fabula Graecanica*) of Apuleius, is ample proof that Greek was not confined to the provinces. Indeed Roman literature depended too closely upon that of Greece to escape the Greek influence upon vocabulary and syntax. As early as the days of Cicero Greek was "the *argot* of literary Rome." Cicero himself admits that even then Greek was more widely understood than Latin[2], and it was Atticus who first openly declared his taste for the letters and art of Greece. Greek words are recorded by Suetonius as occurring in the Letters of Augustus, although, he adds, the Emperor did not write Greek easily[3]. Archaism, too, tended in the same direction,

[1] *Vid. inf.* App.

[2] Cic. *pro Archia*, 10.

[3] Suet. *vit. Aug.* 89.

for the old authors were nearer to the Greek originals. Indeed it has been said that the reign of Hadrian, the lover of all things Greek[1], witnessed a second Greek conquest of the Roman mind, fostered by that Greek literary revival which dated from the days of Plutarch down to Herodes Atticus and Lucian. With the fall of the Greek cities, Greek sophists spread all over the civilised world, from Africa to Gaul; as the world became more Roman, Rome became more cosmopolitan and especially more Greek. The elegance of form of the Greek sophistic drew men like Favorinus and Claudius Aelianus to write in that tongue, while Greek philosophy attracted Marcus Aurelius and those whose bent lay in that direction. The connection between archaism and the Greek Atticism has been already observed[2]; while, on the other hand, the Greek Asianists are probably responsible for much of the rhetorical extravagance which passes for Africanism. Greek learning became, in fact, the fashion, and Lucian describes how Greek tutors were kept in Roman houses, and huge libraries purchased, simply for display. Children were no longer brought up (like the young Gracchi[3]) in the simplicity of their mother tongue, Greek was as familiar to the educated Roman as Latin[4], and it seemed as if it might finally replace Latin altogether.

[1] Cf. Ael. Spart. *vit. Hadr.* 1: "inbutusque inpensius Graecis studiis ingenio eius sic ad ea declinante ut a nonnullis Graeculus diceretur."

[2] *Vid. sup.* p. 22.

[3] Cf. Cic. *Brut.* 58 and Quint. I. 1. 13. Cf. also *ib.* XII. 10. 33: "tanto est sermo Graecus Latino iucundior, ut nostri poetae, quoties dulce carmen esse voluerunt, illorum id nominibus exornarent."

[4] Cf. inscriptions *passim*, e.g. *C. I. L.* VI. 146 of Postumius Festus, Fronto's friend: "orator utraque facundia maximus." (Cf. Fronto, p. 200.) The number of Greek words and verses in Suetonius indicates that Greek was thoroughly well known in his day.

It was at this crisis that Fronto came forward to oppose this Greek invasion of the Latin tongue, and attempted to dissuade his imperial pupil from writing in Greek. "Why buy," he asks, "a foreign wine, inferior to that from one's own vineyard?" About his own Greek composition he is exceedingly modest. "I have written a letter to your mother," he writes to Marcus, "in Greek (such is my impudence) and enclosed it in a letter to you. Do read it first, and if there is any barbarism in it, correct it—for your Greek is fresher than mine—before giving it to your mother. For I do not want your mother to despise me as a boor[1]." In another place he expresses the fear that his Greek is "not quite Attic[2]," since he is "a Libyan of the Libyans." Indeed Marcus is quite surprised to hear that his master has written a Greek composition which has pleased him. "Are you the man," he asks, "who lately reproved me for writing in Greek[3]?" —and proceeds to explain that he himself has only taken to the practice in despair of achieving anything in Latin.

We get the same impression also from a conversation reported by Aulus Gellius[4], in which Fronto, while admitting the greater richness and fulness of Greek, nevertheless insists that the Latin tongue is not so poor, in adjectives of colour for instance, as Favorinus thinks, and deprecates the custom of using a well-known Greek word, *glaucus*,

[1] pp. 24, 25. [2] p. 242. [3] p. 252.

[4] Gell. II. 26. Cf. "non infitias imus quin lingua Graeca, quam tu videre elegisse, prolixior fusiorque sit quam nostra, sed in his tamen coloribus quibus modo dixisti denominandis, non proinde inopes sumus, ut tibi videmur." Cf. *ib.* XIX. 13, where Fronto prefers *pumilio*, which is found in old Latin authors, to *nanus* (the Greek *νᾶνος*) which he calls "sordidum verbum et barbarum," but which is subsequently defended by a passage in Helvius Cinna.

rather than a little known native word *caeruleus*, which is taken from Vergil. Favorinus pays him the compliment of saying that but for him the Greek would have far surpassed the Latin language, but that he has made the victory uncertain.

It is more than possible that Fronto's antipathy to all things Greek was fostered by the fact that by this time philosophy, in accordance with the cosmopolitan character which it was assuming, had adopted the Greek language almost exclusively. Like Latin in the Middle Ages, Greek in the Antonine age had become the natural idiom of those who reasoned and reflected, and Fronto's hatred of philosophy and all its works may have extended to the language of its adoption. For Fronto, like Juvenal[1] in his attitude to the "hungry Greekling," utterly ignores the higher side of Hellenism. Nevertheless there was more than pique at the root of Fronto's opposition to the Graecizing movement, and for a rhetorician nurtured upon Greek rhetoric and sophistic to have grasped in some degree the significance and the perils of that movement is a notable achievement. We have a few Greek letters from Fronto's pen, and of course Greek words occur here and there throughout[2]. Also there are a considerable number of Greek quotations and some Greek proverbs, which are cited by Beltrami as proofs that Fronto was only theoretically opposed to Graecism[3]. Beltrami even

[1] Cf. Juv. *Sat.* III. 76 ff. and Fronto, p. 43, where he calls Herodes Atticus "Graeculum et indoctum."

[2] Cf. Jul. Vict. p. 448. 29 (Halm): "Graece aliquid addere litteris suave est."

[3] Cf. Beltrami, A., *La Tendenze letterarie negli scritti del Frontone*, p. 55. Cf. *ib.* p. 36: "nè deve far meraviglia la simpatia dei Frontoniani per la lingua e la letteratura greca."

credits Fronto with fostering the Hellenistic tendency. "Frontone accentua sempre più questa tendenza[1]." It is true that in one letter Fronto actually praises Marcus for his judicious quotations from Homer in the letter on Sleep[2]. But a quotation from a foreign tongue is a very different matter from the regular and insidious substitution of Greek words for Latin in the literary language—a process by which the native characteristics and physiognomy of a language are completely destroyed. It is interesting to find Lucian criticising the opposite process, the introduction of Latin words into Greek. He writes thus of an emulator of Thucydides: "Ah, I almost forgot to mention one thing—this same writer gives many names of weapons and military engines in Latin—*phossa* for trench, *pons* for bridge, and so forth. Just think of the dignity of the historian and the Thucydidean style—the Attic embroidered with these Latin words, like a toga relieved and picked out with the purple stripe—so harmonious[3]!" Fronto apparently shared this feeling for the incongruity of Latin words in Greek, for a Roman proverb is not given in Latin in a Greek letter[4]. On the whole Greek words are considerably less frequent in Fronto's letters than in those of his correspondents, and they are often rhetorical terms for which no Latin equivalent existed. Thus on one occasion he admits that

[1] Beltrami, *op. cit.* p. 37.

[2] p. 12 (cf. p. 11): "enimvero omnia istaec inter Graecos versus Latina ita scite alternata sunt a te et interposita." Marcus Aurelius often quotes from Greek authors—Homer, Plato, Euripides, etc.

[3] Lucian, *How to write History*, ch. 15 (translation by H. W. and F. G. Fowler, Oxford, 1905).

[4] Cf. p. 239: ἡ δὲ τῶν Ῥωμαίων παροιμία φίλου τρόπον μὴ μισεῖν ἀλλ' εἰδέναι φησὶ δεῖν.

he uses Greek terms in order to explain more clearly a technical point in rhetoric[1]. In spite of his modest self-criticism we find Fronto's Greek composition truly Attic; and indeed Atticism is natural enough in one who was such a thorough-going archaist[2].

In this opposition, on the part of a famous teacher and the founder of a sect[3], to the Greek spirit of his day, it seems hardly extravagant to trace one of those forces which, by keeping Latin alive as a literary language, paved the way for that revival of the Latin speech in the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries, which accompanied the revival of the Roman power and for which the entire credit has generally been given to the rhetorical schools of Gaul.

[1] p. 151.

[2] Cf. E. Norden, *op. cit.* p. 364. For Attic usages cf. the duals on p. 242 (*ἐγραφέσθην*, etc.), p. 255 *γλίχομαι*, p. 257 *τηνάλλως*, etc.

[3] The other members of the sect did not all share Fronto's opinions on this point. Cf. Tert. *adv. Valent.* 6, Gell. II. 23. 2, 3, XIII. 27. 3, XVII. 10, 20, XX. 5, etc. Nevertheless Tertullian abandoned Greek in favour of Latin (cf. *de Coron.* 6, *de Baptism.* 15, and *vid. inf.*), Apuleius preferred the Latin language (cf. *Apol.* 38, 39, etc.), and Cyprian's anti-Greek purism was so strong that he wrote an entire letter on the Eucharist without once using the Greek term. (*Ep.* 63. Cf. E. W. Watson, in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, Vol. IV., Essay 5.) Cyprian avoids Hebrew with equal zeal; e.g. he does not write *Satan* or *Satanas*, though he uses *Gehenna* and occasionally *mamona* and *sabbatum*. Watson regards his hostility to Greek as an early indication of the severance between Eastern and Western Christianity.

CHAPTER V.

MARCUS AURELIUS.

"Permittite...illi ut homo sit, neque enim vel philosophia vel imperium tollit affectus."

ANT. PIUS, ap. JUL. CAPIT. *vit. Ant. Pii* 10.

"Diis vita ac morte coniunctus."

JUL. CAPIT. *vit. M. Ant. Phil.* 18.

"Ita egregio ingenio natus es." FRONTO, p. 100.

APART from the merit of reflecting the decadence of the age in which they were written, there is one other tribute which is unanimously paid to these letters of Fronto and his friends, even by those who most emphatically deny their claim to literary interest. Niebuhr himself gives them a word of grudging praise, on the ground that in these pages "Marcus Aurelius is brought before our eyes." Slight touches, scattered here and there, give us a picture of Marcus Aurelius as boy and man, in those early years before the evolution of the Emperor and the Stoic, and form an authentic and most valuable complement to the other self-drawn portrait of the *Meditations*.

The outstanding feature of the letters which pass between master and pupil is the frankness, amounting

often to gush, with which the two reveal their mutual affection—an effusion which bursts upon us with something of a shock in its contrast to Roman *gravitas* and Stoic austerity. Between Fronto and Marcus there is a friendly rivalry in love, in which the latter has at last to admit himself beaten. "I yield," he writes, "you have conquered. You have beaten the lovers of all time in love's contest. Take the crown and let the herald proclaim that glorious victory of yours openly before your tribunal: 'M. C. Fronton a la victoire; il reçoit la couronne des grands luttes d'amour[1].' But I, though beaten, will nevertheless neither withdraw from nor relax my own zeal[2]." He cannot find words to express his love. "For I am not content," he writes, "with the usual, ordinary words. My joy is far too burning for me to express my heart's gladness in common speech[3]."

He longs for Fronto's approval[4], for his constant presence. On one occasion, when Fronto has been ill, he writes: "While you lie on your sick-bed, my spirit too will lie prone; and when, by God's grace, you shall stand upon your feet, my spirit too will stand firm, which is now consumed by a burning longing for you. Farewell, soul of your prince, your friend, your pupil[5]." Throughout Fronto's many and various bodily afflictions the sympathy of the man whose disregard for his own health is notorious[6]

[1] So Prof. Robinson Ellis translates the Greek of the original.

[2] p. 26.

[3] p. 50, reading (with Desrousseaux) *ardentius* for MS. *a...tius*, Naber *amantius*.

[4] p. 39.

[5] p. 56.

[6] It must be admitted that in the earlier letters Marcus shows a great interest in his own health as well as in Fronto's symptoms. Cf. esp. pp. 68, 69.

is lavished upon him. He deplores the duties which keep him from flying to his friend, longs to be with him, to hold his hand, gently to chafe his foot, with his own arm to support his steps[1]. He begs for details—which, it must be admitted, Fronto is generally only too ready to supply —and is willing to give up all the Catos and Ciceros and Sallusts, if only he may see Fronto restored to health "even without any books[2]." He cannot work for anxiety[3], for Fronto is to him "the greatest thing beneath the sky, my glory[4]," "dearest and sweetest of masters[5]," "sweetest soul[6]." Still more tender is his letter after the death of Fronto's grandson: "Grieving as I do when one of your joints pains you, what do you think I feel, dear master, when you have pain of mind?[7]"

On Fronto's side the affection is if anything stronger, for to the love of friend for friend is joined the pride of a master in his pupil. It is for Marcus' sake that he loves life[8] and clings to it in spite of constant ill-health[9]; for his sake, or for that of his children, he would gladly forfeit it[10]. "Who can be happier than I," he cries, "to whom you send such a fragrant letter?...Do you think any pain can touch my body for such deep joy?[11]" That he knows himself unworthy of Marcus' love does not greatly trouble him, for to him it is just its spontaneity which gives it its greatest charm. Here is no calculated affection, founded on reason and given in return for benefits bestowed. Free and natural[12], it resembles the trees on the mountain side, which, raised by nature's wind

[1] pp. 3, 4. [2] p. 93 ("vel sine libris"). [3] p. 92.
[4] p. 254. [5] p. 48. [6] p. 30. [7] p. 231.
[8] p. 59. [9] p. 85. [10] p. 89. [11] p. 5.
[12] p. 7 ("sine ratione exortus").

and rain, grow to greater strength and beauty than the cultivated garden shrubs; for the creations of nature are ever finer than the products of man's skill. "What is the point of all these illustrations?" he asks. "Simply to prove that I am right in preferring that your love for me should be spontaneous, based on caprice rather than on reason or on any service I have rendered[1]." His pride in Marcus' love is unbounded. "No sea," he declares, "is so deep as your love to me[2]." He writes in ecstasy on hearing that Marcus had read aloud and copied one of his speeches, and even his consulship gives him less joy than his friend's congratulations on his success[3].

But it is not merely in the guise of an affectionate pupil and sympathetic friend that Marcus Aurelius appears in these pages. Their great value lies in their naturalness, for they bring the philosopher down to earth and remind us that the Stoic is still human. In one letter we find him telling Fronto not to show his verses to a soul[4], in another naïvely admitting that he has a secret liking for some, though most of them end in the fire[5]. Another day he complains that there is not a thing to write about, and falls back upon the weather, after the manner of the desperate in every age[6]. Now he describes his daily life at home, his long talks by his mother's sofa[7] —the mother who taught him "abstinence not only from evil deeds but also from evil thoughts,"—his attendance upon his adoptive father[8], to whom he was so devoted that Fronto writes: "I am not at all surprised that you have

[1] pp. 7 ff. and p. 216. [2] p. 18. [3] p. 18.
[4] p. 24. [5] p. 34. [6] p. 30. [7] p. 70, cf. *Med.* I. 3.
[8] p. 69 and p. 103. Marcus was only two nights away from Antoninus Pius in twenty-three years. Cf. *Med.* I. 16.

read with pleasure the eulogies which I pronounced upon your father in the Senate, both as consul elect and on taking up office; you would listen to the very Parthians and Spaniards praising your father in their own tongue as if they were the greatest orators[1]." And when in after years Marcus became himself a father, he lavished on his "nest[2]" of young ones the deepest affection. Summer heat is spring to him if his children are well[3]; and during the illness of his little daughter the busy Emperor finds time to send word to his friend when she turns the corner. "Just at present inexorable duties oppress me. Meanwhile I send you a short note—for I am busy—to tell you what you want to know, dear master—our little one is better, and is running about her bedroom[4]."

Many a characteristic attributed to Marcus Aurelius by history or implied in his *Meditations* finds in these letters its illustration. History and the self-revelation of later years alike present him to us as peace-loving, gentle, unselfish, humble, brave—a man of thought driven by circumstances into a life of strenuous action—a life which was indeed "more like wrestling than dancing[5]." Every one of these traits is confirmed by the letters. As a boy of eighteen the young Marcus makes peace between Fronto and another of his tutors, Herodes Atticus, by a letter which is a model of grace and good taste[6]. "I love you both," he urges, and pleads that the case between them may be given a fair hearing on its merits, and that

[1] p. 105. [2] p. 94. [3] p. 82.

[4] p. 230. For his love for his children cf. *Med.* I. 13: ("I learned... to love my children truly") and I. 17 ("I am thankful to the gods...that my children have not been stupid nor deformed in body....That I had abundance of good masters for my children").

[5] *Med.* VII. 61. [6] pp. 40, 41.

irrelevant personalities may be avoided[1], for he is anxious that Fronto shall do nothing unworthy of himself[2]. The episode is to the credit of both, for Fronto does not resent his pupil's interference, admits that since Herodes Atticus is Marcus' friend the probability is that he is after all a good fellow, and promises in his prosecution of Herodes to keep strictly to the facts—which, he remarks incidentally, are "sufficiently atrocious." In later years we find the two opponents true friends, in spite, as Fronto says, of the speech which he had published against Herodes and which was still extant[3]. "Of all your virtues," writes Fronto to Marcus, "this is especially admirable, that you link together all your friends in harmony[4]."

No less humble than tactful, Marcus fears Fronto may think him "a rash stripling[5]" for interfering in this affair. For humility was ever the spirit of Marcus' life. At twenty-five he is harassed by the thought of the little he has done with his time[6]; he is reluctant to accept the title of *Armeniacus* after Verus' Armenian campaign[7]; and in the face of Fronto's literary excellence takes to writing Greek, in despair of being able to write Latin[8].

The temperament which made Marcus Aurelius a Stoic long before he knew Rusticus inspires the words: "I should be ashamed if I allowed my courage to fail while yet my body is able to endure the shock of weak-

[1] p. 43. [2] p. 44.
[3] p. 111. Cf. p. 61 and p. 138. [4] p. 59.
[5] p. 41, "audax puerulus." [6] p. 75.
[7] p. 121. Cf. Capit. *vit. M. Ant. Phil.* 9: "delatum Armeniacum nomen utrique principum, quod Marcus per verecundiam primo recusavit, postea tamen recepit."
[8] p. 252.

ness[1]." There are many references in the letters, as in the *Meditations*[2], to physical ill-health, and the very frequency with which in the latter Marcus has to assure himself that weariness and pain are nothing, and that the soul is above such considerations of sense, suggests a human weakness of the flesh which required constant support from the willing spirit. The casual sentence "It is so cold in my bedroom that I can scarcely put my hand out[3]" accords well with the story which Capitolinus tells of Marcus' mother restraining him as a child from sleeping on the bare floor[4]. Busy all day, he spent most of his nights in study, for he was a hard worker; indeed on one occasion he writes to tell Fronto that he has made excerpts from sixty books in the course of two days[5]. This was before he learnt from Rusticus "to read carefully and not to be satisfied with a superficial understanding of a book[6]," but the number is considerable, in spite of his reassuring remark that some of them were short—mere "Atellan farces of Novius, or little speeches of Scipio." It is sad to find him reflecting in the *Meditations* that he will never read his own memoirs nor "the selections from books which thou wast reserving for thy old age[7]."

Human enough to love holidays, as a Stoic he distrusted them. "Men seek retreats for themselves," he says, "houses in the country, sea-shores and mountains; and thou too art wont to desire such things very much[8]."

[1] p. 71. Cf. *Med.* VI. 29: "It is a shame for the soul to be the first to give way in this life, when thy body does not give way."

[2] Cf. *Med.* I. 8, 15 and 17, V. 1, VI. 2, VII. 64, VIII. 12, etc.

[3] p. 93. Cf. *Med.* VI. 2: "Let it make no difference to thee whether thou art cold or warm."

[4] Capit. *vit.* 2. [5] Fr. p. 34. [6] *Med.* I. 7.

[7] *Med.* III. 14. [8] *ib.* IV. 3.

Such a desire he feels to be "the mark of the most common sort of men" and he resists it accordingly—"Be sober," he urges, "in thy relaxation[1]." But his strong spirit overtaxed his weak body[2], and we find Fronto pleading again and again that he will take more sleep and give himself a real holiday. "What bow," he asks, "is always on the stretch?[3]" "At least sleep enough for a free man[4]."

There was much in an Emperor's life which was naturally distasteful to Marcus Aurelius[5]. He himself was a thinker, a philosopher, and a scholar with a taste for antiquities[6] and for history, rather than a lawgiver, a statesman, a practical politician, or a general. He was not unaware of the difficulties of his position, and in one passage of the *Meditations*[7] takes himself to task for excessive gravity in discharging his public duties. Was it perhaps Fronto who opened his eyes to the danger? Realising that the Emperor must not compromise his popularity, Fronto wrote: "I have sometimes found fault with you in your absence somewhat seriously...at times, for example, when you mixed in society with a more solemn look than was fitting[8], or would read books in the

[1] *Med.* IV. 26.

[2] Cf. Capit. *vit.* 3: "tantumque operis et laboris studiis impendit ut corpus adficeret." Cf. Dio Cass. LXXI. 1 and 6.

[3] p. 225.

[4] p. 227. Cf. pp. 9—12, 77, 78, 230, etc. Judging by the hour at which Marcus went to bed, we are not surprised that he found it difficult to get up in the morning. Cf. *Med.* V. 1, VI. 2, VII. 64, VIII. 12, etc.

[5] Cf. *Med.* V. 16, etc.

[6] Cf. the visit to Anagnia, Fr. 66, 67, and *Med.* I. 4, III. 14, IV. 32, 33, VII. 1, VIII. 3, 25, 31, 37, X. 27, 37, XII. 27.

[7] *Med.* VII. 24.

[8] Cf. *Med.* VII. 24.

theatre[1] or at dinner. At such times, then, I used to call you a hard man, poor company, even disagreeable sometimes, when anger got the better of me[2]." There were strange rumours afloat; it was said that this "Caesar of the passionless face[3]" intended to suppress public festivities, to make everyone as grave as himself. Even Marcus Aurelius, popular as he was, did not go wholly uncriticised, and there must have been some who echoed the words of Avidius Cassius—"Marcus Antoninus philosophizes and enquires about elements and souls and the honourable and the just, and has no perception about the state[4]." Fronto did Marcus and his subjects a good service in bringing the philosopher down from the clouds to that corner of the earth whose affairs it happened to be his duty temporarily to administer.

Yet of all the glimpses which the letters give us of this man whom Matthew Arnold thought the most beautiful figure in history and Taine the noblest soul that ever lived, I would select two as most interesting, because they illustrate two characteristics not generally associated with the great Stoic. The first is an account of an escapade with some shepherds, in which the young Marcus

[1] Cf. Capit. *vit.* 15: "fuit autem consuetudo Marco ut in Circensium spectaculo legeret, audiretque ac subscriberet, ex quo quidem saepe iocis popularibus dicitur lacessitus."

[2] p. 74. Cf. Capit. *vit.* 2: "fuit a prima infantia gravis." Cf. *ib.* 4 and 16: "erat enim ipse tantae tranquillitatis ut vultum nunquam mutaverit maerore vel gaudio."

[3] Cf. Eutrop. VIII. 11: "...adeo ut, in infantia quoque, vultum nec ex gaudio nec ex maerore mutaret."

[4] Vulc. Gallic. *vit. Avid. Cass.* 14 (quoted from a letter of Av. Cass.): "Marcus Antoninus philosophatur et quaerit de elementis et de animis et de honesto et de iusto, nec sentit de republica."

is refreshingly boyish[1]. It would seem that Renan[2] has represented him as "detached" from the common things of life, its little joys and excitements, at too early an age, and we like Marcus Aurelius more, not less, for the touch of the human boy in him. The other is a short letter in which, after hearing cases late into the night, he cries, with that weariness of the endless round of law-court and theatre which oppressed him all his life[3]: "I am so tired that I can scarcely breathe[4]." "Ita sum defessus"; the Stoic is after all a man, who in his busy life is often "weary in the evening and sleepy in the day[5]."

In the famous gallery of worthies to whom Marcus Aurelius expresses his indebtedness Fronto finds a place[6]. Yet even this honour has tended to his undoing, thanks to the shrewdness of those critics who have pointed out with triumph that there is no word of thanks for all the literary training which Marcus received at his hands. "From Fronto," says Marcus, "I learned to observe what envy, and duplicity, and hypocrisy are in a tyrant, and that generally those among us who are called Patricians are rather deficient in paternal affection[7]." The lesson was not unimportant for one who was to be a ruler of men. But it was by no means the only one which Marcus owed to Fronto. Years before on receiving a letter from his master he wrote: "While reading it I exclaimed

[1] pp. 35, 36. [2] Renan, *Marc-Aurèle*, p. 9.

[3] Cf. pp. 30, 34, 92, 106, 230, 331, etc. He constantly harps upon the weariness and boredom of the law-courts (cf. p. 68: "causidicali prosum odio et tedio"), and draws a sharp distinction between the lawyer and the true orator.

[4] p. 37. [5] p. 34. [6] *Med.* I. 11.

[7] Long's translation. φιλοστοργία is rather, perhaps, "warmheartedness." Cf. pp. 135, 176, 231.

again and again 'What a happy man I am.' 'Are you so happy?' someone will say, 'because there is someone to teach you how to write a *sententia* more skilfully, clearly, concisely, and smoothly?' That is not the reason why I call myself happy. Why is it, then? Because I learn the truth from you....At the same time you teach me to listen to the truth[1]." "You do not cease," he says again, "to guide me into the path of truth and to open my eyes." "Il découvrit," says de Suckau[2], "qu'en apprenant à écrire il apprenait à penser, et qu'il devenait plus capable de comprendre la verité en devenant plus capable de la communiquer aux autres."

The philosopher in Marcus triumphed over the artist and Rusticus[3] the Stoic supplanted Fronto the rhetorician. Attracted by the simplicity of a letter which Rusticus had written to his mother, Marcus turned from the rhetoric which failed to satisfy his soul to the study of Aristo and Epictetus. He has plenty of time, he writes, for Fronto's themes, but the books of Aristo have beguiled him[4]. The subjects which his master sends him do not just suit his taste, and he can no longer bring himself to argue for and against the same proposition[5]. There is a certain want of a sense of proportion in this mind which sees a moral question at stake in a rhetorical exercise; Fronto was not necessarily less honest and upright because he could make out an imaginary case for and

[1] p. 49.

[2] Cf. Ed. de Suckau, *Étude sur Marc-Aurèle*, 1857. Cf. G. Boissier, *La jeunesse de Marc-Aurèle*, *sup. cit.* "Les lieux communs l'amenaient naturellement à traiter du vice et de la vertu, et à propos des métaphores et des sentences on parlait souvent de l'homme et de la vie."

[3] Cf. *Med.* I. 7, and Capit., *vit.* 3.

[4] p. 75.

[5] p. 76.

against the tribune Lucilius[1]. But the fact was that Marcus' heart was no longer in his work, and, although he kept up a feigned interest in rhetoric for Fronto's sake, the vehemence of the *de Eloquentia* proves how little Fronto was deceived.

As Emperor, however, Marcus found rhetoric indispensable to him, and to Fronto's joy turned to him again for help. That which he forsook when it was merely a pleasure had become a duty, and as such must be well performed. We even find him writing to his old tutor for literary refreshment[2] and admitting the advantage of "polishing four or five lines every day[3]."

Fronto did Marcus good service in impressing upon the dreamy philosopher the practical importance of public speaking to a man in his position; but to expect the author of the *Meditations* to acknowledge that debt on its purely literary side is to misunderstand the whole development of character which Marcus Aurelius had undergone from the time when he first met Rusticus. All the gratitude which he expresses in the *Meditations* is gratitude for moral lessons, just as all the qualities which he praises are moral qualities. It was not that rhetoric and literature in general did not appeal to him. Rather it was just because they appealed to him so strongly, just because he was susceptible to their charm, that, with the spirit of the born ascetic, he distrusted them. The man who wrote that he learnt from Alexander the grammarian "to refrain from fault-finding and not in a reproachful way to chide those who uttered any barbarous or soloecistic or strange-sounding expression[4]" was sensi-

[1] p. 83. [2] p. 105. [3] p. 253.
[4] Cf. *Med.* i. 10.

tive to the day of his death to the music of words; the man who cried "Throw away thy books[1]," "Cast away the thirst after books[2]," was the same who wrote to his master: "I want refreshment and especially something the reading of which can lift me out of the thoughts that have taken possession of me, and cheer me[3]." Yet he distrusts it all, telling his master that when he has said anything more beautiful than usual he feels pleased with himself and that on that account he is shunning eloquence. Fronto's answer is characteristic: "Should you not rather correct and remedy that fault of self-conceit instead of blaming the source of it? If you are pleased with yourself when you have given a just verdict, will you repudiate justice? If you are pleased with yourself for some attention to your father, will you spurn filial affection? You are pleased with yourself when you are eloquent; lash yourself then—why lash eloquence[4]?" Without denying Marcus Aurelius one iota of that "exquisite moral refinement" which Hastings Crossley finds in his scruples, may one not admit that there is truth in Fronto's criticism, and that Marcus himself, not eloquence, is to blame? It is well for the world that the risk of growing conceited has not deterred all those authors who have consciously rejoiced in their art.

"From Rusticus," says Marcus, with a vehemence which again betrays the hold which rhetoric had had upon him, "I learned not to be led astray to sophistic emulation, nor to writing on speculative matters, nor to delivering little hortatory orations;...and to abstain from rhetoric and poetry and fine writing,...and to write my

[1] Cf. *Med.* II. 2.
[2] Cf. *Med.* II. 3.
[3] p. 105.
[4] p. 143.

letters with simplicity, like the letter which Rusticus wrote from Sinuessa to my mother;...and not hastily to give my assent to those who talk overmuch[1]." It would be as impossible for the man who felt thus about rhetoric to thank the tutor who had instructed him in its pernicious delights as for St Augustine to express gratitude to the master who had introduced him to Vergil and Dido. Rather he writes: "I thank the gods that I did not make more proficiency in rhetoric, poetry and the other studies in which I should perhaps have been completely engaged if I had seen that I was making progress in them[2]," and bids himself "wipe out imagination[3]."

The actual literary debt of Marcus to Fronto seems small, for Marcus succeeded in severing himself so absolutely from rhetoric that the only direct trace of Fronto's influence on the *Meditations* is found in its archaisms[4], and perhaps in the frequent use of diminutives[5] (though these were by that time in common use), and in its large and rare vocabulary[6]. Nevertheless, the popularity of the Emperor's speeches, to which Fronto himself testifies, did him a service the credit for which is largely due to his master.

Gaston Boissier, to whose fascinating essay "La Jeunesse de Marc-Aurèle" I am greatly indebted, was,

[1] *Med.* I. 7. [2] *Med.* I. 17.

[3] *Med.* IX. 7. Cf. *ib.* VII. 17, 29.

[4] Cf. Herodian, *Hist.* I. i. 2. ὁ βασιλεύων Μάρκος...λόγων ἀρχαιότητος ἦν ἐραστὴς ὡς μηδενὸς μήτε Ῥωμαίων μήτε Ἑλλήνων ἀπολείπεσθαι.

[5] Cf. *Med.* VIII. 3, etc., and Gataker's note on IV. 48.

[6] Cf. the comment of the Lyons editor: "utitur vocibus plane suis, quas raro apud alios auctores invenias." For ἅπαξ λεγόμενα in the *Meditations*, cf. I. 7 and 16, IV. 3, VII. 68, IX. 13, etc. Marcus may have learnt from Fronto his interest in etymology. Cf. *Med.* VIII. 57, IX. 10, X. 21, etc.

I believe, the first to point out that much of the apparent artificiality of the letters is due to the relation of master and pupil in which the two correspondents stand[1]. The one is seeking to deserve praise, the other to give his pupil a model; and hence there arises sometimes excess of ornament, a want of complete naturalness, a feeling of strain and effort. "I have written this hurriedly," says Marcus, "...so I do beg of you that if a word is out of place, an expression careless or a letter ill-formed, you will attribute it to want of time: for, while loving you most dearly as a friend, I must remember that the reverence I owe to my master is as great as the love I owe to my friend[2]."

Before we take leave of Marcus Aurelius as a pupil, it is cheering to find that even he, model student as he was, fell short at times of his master's standard. On one occasion, for instance, he observed that the Parthians wore loose sleeves "in order that there might be room to keep the heat hung up[3]." While commending the effort to find a picturesque metaphor, Fronto points out that the expression is frankly "absurd," and after the manner of tutors proceeds to show how Marcus, after the manner of pupils, has used the one really impossible word. "Heat," he says, "can be thrust down, driven down, pass down, be brought round, intercepted, ventilated; in fact, *anything* rather than 'hung up'[4]." Marcus took his criticisms in good part. "Happy am I," he writes, "to be found worthy of praise and blame by the greatest of orators, and best of men, my friend Marcus Cornelius[5]."

[1] G. Boissier, *op. cit.* p. 683. [2] p. 61.
[3] p. 66. [4] p. 66. [5] p. 55.

CHAPTER VI.

LUCIUS VERUS.

"Nemo est principum quem non gravis fama perstringat."
CAPIT. *vit. M. Ant. Phil.* 15.

IN the case of Marcus Aurelius the verdict of history is, as we have seen, confirmed by these letters. His colleague Lucius Verus, on the other hand, is presented to us here in a far more favourable light than in other records, as regards both his character and his ability. The picture of Verus which we have in these letters is less black than that of Capitolinus, and, in the light of all that we know of Verus' life, more convincing. The letters show that Marcus at any rate loved and respected this weaker brother, as, indeed, he tells us in the *Meditations*[1], and that he missed him sorely during his absence on campaign. Fronto, too, couples Verus with Marcus in his regard[2], is cheered in sorrow by his sympathy[3], and longs to live to see him return from the East in all the glory of victory[4]. He takes the greatest pride in his

[1] Cf. *Med.* I. 17. "I thank the gods for giving me such a brother, who was able by his moral character to rouse me to vigilance over myself, and who, at the same time, pleased me by his respect and affection." Cf. p. 102.

[2] p. 117. [3] p. 137. [4] p. 132.

oratorical triumphs, for Verus too was his pupil. "Your brother's speech delighted me," he writes to Marcus; "for it was eloquent and spirited, and I know he had very little time for preparation[1]"; and again, in 164 A.D., after the arrival of Verus' Armenian despatch to the Senate, he writes: "Now I can die happy, for I have reaped rich fruit for my toil and left a glorious monument to eternal fame. That I have been your master all men know, or think, or will believe when you tell them[2]." The clearness, the eloquence, and withal the brevity of this despatch arouse his highest admiration. It is "eloquent, as from an orator, energetic, as from a general, serious, as addressed to the Senate, concise, as becomes its military subject[3]." In the combination of literary and strategical ability he compares Verus to Caesar[4], and it is to him that he applies Cato's famous definition of an orator, "vir bonus dicendi peritus,"—"a good man and an experienced speaker[5]." There could be no higher praise from one to whom Cato was an oracle. Yet this is the man of whom Capitolinus says: "He is said to have been a better orator than poet; but it would be nearer the truth to say he was a worse poet than orator[6]."

Fronto's affection and regard were warmly reciprocated. Verus is seriously annoyed with his brother for allowing Fronto to leave the palace one day without seeing him[7], thanks Fronto for having taught him "simplicity and true love, long before the art of smooth speaking[8]," and

[1] p. 87. [2] p. 120. [3] p. 126. [4] p. 221. [5] p. 121.

[6] Jul. Capit., *vit. L. Ver.* 2: "melior quidem orator fuisse dicitur quam poeta, immo, ut verius dicam, peior poeta quam rhetor."

[7] p. 116.

[8] p. 130. "Frontonem, a quo ego prius multo simplicitatem verumque amorem quam loquendi polite disciplinam didicisse me praedico."

entrusts to him the task of celebrating his military achievements in Syria. After promising to send him his despatches, sketch-plans and note-books for the purpose, he adds, with implicit faith in his master's powers and the persuasiveness of rhetoric: "Though you cannot make my actions other than they are, you can make them seem anything you may desire[1]."

To Verus as a soldier Fronto pays high tribute, especially in regard to his reforms in the army, which, when he took it over, was sunk in luxury and utterly inefficient. "The soldiers had been wont to applaud at the stage plays and were better acquainted with the nearest restaurant than the battlefield....Few of the men could vault on horseback; the rest scrambled up with difficulty, with the help of heel, knee and leg[2]." According to Fronto Verus was most energetic in restoring discipline. "All this degradation of military discipline Lucius checked, setting before them as an example his own military activity. First of all he himself on the march used to tramp wearily on on foot, quite as often as ride on horseback; he made as light of the sun's scorching heat as of a fine day; he put up with thick clouds of dust and thought little of sweat on his armour, as in the games; he left his head exposed to sun and rain, hail and snow, nor did he even cover it to defend it against darts; he took trouble to review the soldiers in the field, and to visit the sick....He himself used to bathe late, after business was done, keeping a moderate table and living in camp on the fare of the common soldiers;... he liked work better than leisure; indeed he applied his leisure time to work and devoted any time that was not

[1] p. 132. [2] p. 128.

occupied in military affairs to civil business....He slept the sleep which has been earned by hard work, not courted by quiet. Serious misdeeds he punished at last with severity, but of lesser faults he feigned ignorance, and left scope for repentance. For many, when they think no one has found them out, amend their evil ways, but when they are aware that their crimes are known, are confirmed in their shameless course[1]."

In spite of the extravagance of the *Principia Historiae*, in which Fronto (who conceives of history as a species of rhetorical exercise[2]) compares Verus with Trajan, to the disadvantage of the latter, one is inclined to think that its author comes nearer the truth than is commonly supposed, and to agree with a recent American biographer of Marcus Aurelius, Mr P. B. Watson, that "Verus must have been a clever fellow." It is at least certain that he understood the art of choosing his subordinates; nor would it seem that he left all the work to them and took all the credit to himself. He was himself purveyor to the army—a post involving much work and worry. Indeed he is so busy (he writes to Fronto) that he cannot find time even to write a letter[3]. As Mr Watson says, "it is absurd to imagine that an Emperor who was being jeered at in the East for his licentiousness[4] would write thus to Rome, complaining of the anxieties of the war, which scarcely gave him an opportunity to write a letter."

Historians have not dealt kindly with Verus. History, in the eyes of men like Julius Capitolinus, Aelius Spartianus

[1] pp. 207, 208. [2] *Vid. inf.*, ch. VII.

[3] pp. 129 ff. Cf. esp. p. 130: "curarum vero, quae me dies noctesque miserrimum habuere et prope ad desperationem summae rei perduxere, facere participem hominem carissimum...fateor non lubebat."

[4] Cf. Capit., *op. cit.* 7, "risui fuit omnibus Syris."

and the rest, loses its savour if it contains no gossip; and gossip found in Verus' colleague a strangely difficult subject. It is true that Capitolinus places Verus "neither among the good Emperors nor among the bad[1]," but his racy sketch of the doings of Verus in Syria[2] makes one wonder what an Emperor must do to be really "bad." Fronto himself accounts for the questionable reputation of Verus by observing that "just as we see the tallest trees shaken most violently by the wind, so it is the greatest virtues which are open to the more vicious attacks of jealousy[3]." But then Fronto was misguided enough to love this scapegrace. Marcus loved him too, and one might apply to the case of Verus Fronto's words to Marcus about Herodes Atticus: "It is nearer the truth that he is a good fellow, since you esteem him worthy of your protection[4]." But "laudari a laudato viro" is evidence whose worth the historians will not admit, and Capitolinus merely adduces it as a fresh proof of the virtues of Marcus, who championed his brother in spite of his disapproval of that brother's vices[5]. Truly the post of younger brother to a paragon is hard to fill.

[1] Capit., *op. cit.* 1.

[2] Capit., *op. cit.* 4 and 10. Cf. *vit. M. Ant. Phil.* 8.

[3] p. 209.

[4] p. 42.

[5] Cf. Capit., *vit. M. Ant. Phil.* 15: "tantae...sanctitatis fuit Marcus ut Veri vitia et celaverit et defenderit cum ei vehementissime displiceret." Cf. *ib.* 8.

CHAPTER VII.

FRONTO AS A HISTORIAN.

BEFORE we come to investigate further the contribution of Fronto to our knowledge of the age in which he lived, we must further consider his conception of history, since on that conception his worth as a historian depends. Fronto, as we have said, conceived of history simply as a branch of rhetoric. Indeed, we may as well admit at the outset that the light he throws upon history we owe mainly to incidental allusions and not to the two fragments of historical composition which have come down to us.

The earlier of these two historical fragments, the *de Bello Parthico*[1], was written after a defeat of the Romans at the beginning of the Parthian campaign[2], and is a consolatory letter rather than a piece of history, the aim

[1] pp. 217—222. Cf. Monceaux, *Les Africains*, p. 231. "Une dissertation adressé à Marc-Aurèle à la suite d'une défaite des Romains au début de la campagne; c'est une mélange de narrations, d'allusions aux exploits des anciens temps, de consolations et de conseils, et si l'on y mentionne les revers, c'est pour rendre plus éclatante la vengeance des Romains." Guissani, *Letteratura Romana*, p. 426, calls it: "la più vacua diceria retorica che immaginar si possa."

[2] Probably in 161 A.D. (So Brakman.)

of which is to show that reverse has often before in the history of Rome preceded victory and vengeance. The *Principia Historiae*[1] which Fronto wrote at Verus' own request, and with the aid of Verus' own note-books and sketch-plans[2], was probably written in 165, at the close of the campaign. It would be a far safer and fairer criterion of Fronto's abilities as a historian if it had come down to us in a less fragmentary condition. In spite of Dr Hauler's[3] brilliant reconstruction of a portion of the codex hitherto practically unintelligible, we are constantly faced with the alternatives of lacuna or conjecture, and, while the former is not illuminating, the latter is often not Fronto.

History according to the rhetorical conception often degenerates into panegyric; and human nature being what it is, adulation is rarely strictly truthful, and to discuss the veracity of a panegyric becomes in consequence a futile process. The *Principia Historiae* is simply a panegyric of Lucius Verus; and, since Fronto laboured under the common delusion that the best way to praise one man's exploits is to depreciate the merits of someone else who has been engaged in a similar occupation, Trajan is selected for comparison with Verus, and his reputation suffers in the process, in spite of Fronto's final protestation that "the two can be distinguished only by their names[4]."

[1] pp. 202—210. [2] pp. 131, 132.

[3] Cf. Ed. Hauler, "Frontonianum," in *Serta Harteliana*, Vienna, 1896, pp. 263—269. pp. 264, 265 give a facsimile of Cod. Ambros. p. 251.

[4] p. 210: "comparata si quis leget, seu proavus seu pronepos virtute praestare videbitur, comparationis quidem discrimen in familiae nomine permanebit." In his eulogy of Verus Fronto has been charged with unfairness to Avidius Cassius, Verus' general, to whom the capture of Ctesiphon in 165, which ended the campaign, was largely due (cf. Naber,

As Monceaux very truly comments: "Par cette façon de comprendre son rôle d'historien, Fronton, l'honnête homme que nous connaissons, se serait déshonoré, s'il avait vu dans l'histoire autre chose qu'un exercice de rhétorique[1]." Lucian, who had suffered much from the prevailing mania for writing histories of the Parthian war—histories so frigid that "Caspian snows and Celtic ice are warm by comparison[2]," insists with his usual acuteness upon the essential difference between history and panegyric. "It is the fashion," he writes, "to neglect the examination of facts and give the space gained to eulogies of generals and commanders....They forget that between history and panegyric there is a great gulf fixed, barring communication; in musical phrase, the two things are a couple of octaves apart[3]."

Of the use of the rhetorical style for history Lucian likewise disapproves. The historian, he says, "is not to set about his work armed to the teeth from the rhetorician's arsenal of impetuosity and incisiveness, rolling periods, close-packed arguments and the rest: for him a serener mood. His matter should be homogeneous and compact, his vocabulary fit to be understanded of the people, for the clearest possible setting forth of his sub-

Proleg. xxx). It is only natural that the exploits of the general should not be specially emphasized in a panegyric upon his chief; but in a letter to Avidius Cassius himself (p. 178) Fronto refers to his stern upholding of discipline, "disciplinae ad priscum morem institutae ac retentae" (cf. Vulc. Gallic., *vit. Avid. Cass.*, 4, 5), and shows that he was not blind to the part which he played.

[1] Monceaux, *op. cit.* p. 231.

[2] Lucian, *How to write history*, 19. Cf. also *The True History*, a skit in which Lucian begins by humbly soliciting his readers' incredulity.

[3] *ib.* ch. 7. Trans. by H. W. and F. G. Fowler, Oxford, 1905

ject[1]." He must tell a thing as it happened, calling a spade a spade[2]; his diction must be content with *terra firma*, though his spirit should not be without a touch of the poetical[3]; and in the marshalling of his words "a moderate compromise is desirable between the harshness which results from separating what belongs together, and the jingling concatenations, one may almost call them, which are so common[4]." It might be Fronto's *Principia Historiae* which is in Lucian's mind, so accurate is the description.

The rhetorical conception of history did not originate with Fronto. Centuries before, the rhetorical amplifications and devices of Theopompus already betrayed the influence of the school of Isocrates. "Il ne suffit pas à Théopompe," says Chassang[5], "de déployer comme ses rivaux et comme Thucydide lui-même ses qualités oratoires dans des discours supposés; frère d'un rhéteur, rhéteur lui-même, il porte dans l'histoire les procédés de la rhétorique, il aime l'emphase et prodigue l'hyperbole." Even Cicero calls history "a work especially of orators[6]"; Atticus (in the *Brutus*) admits that rhetoricians need not adhere rigorously to the truth in history[7], and Quintilian

[1] *ib.* ch. 43. [2] *ib.* ch. 39. [3] *ib.* ch. 45. [4] *ib.* ch. 46.

[5] Chassang, *Histoire du Roman*, p. 36. Cf. *ib.* pp. 88 ff. for an account of the influence of the rhetorical schools upon history, and the intrusion into history of the fictitious element. Cf. *ib.* p. 89: "au sortir des écoles, les récits historiques étaient devenus des romans: pour s'en convaincre, on n'a qu'à comparer la vie de Démosthène chez Plutarque et chez les rhéteurs."

[6] Cic. *de Leg.* I. 2: "historia oratorum maxime opus." Cf. Sen. *Suas.* 5, 8: "disertissimam sententiam dixit quae vel in oratione vel in historia ponatur."

[7] Cic. *Brut.* II. 42: "quoniam quidem concessum est rhetoribus mentiri in historiis, ut aliquid dicere possint argutius."

finds it more akin to poetry, and calls it "a poem without the metre[1]." The scientific conception of history is a modern growth, and to demand it of Fronto is to forget that, in Greece and Rome, history, instead of being taught in the schools as a distinct branch of knowledge, merely furnished rhetoric with subjects for declamation, moral discourses and fictitious letters[2].

In history as in oratory Fronto turned back to the *veteres* as his models. Cato is his ideal[3], and there are many recollections of Sallust[4]. Far more curious is the indisputable imitation in the *Principia Historiae* of Livy[5], an author of an epoch upon which Fronto does not often draw.

The *Principia Historiae* is not, as we shall see later, devoid of all historical value, as Niebuhr found it. In its fragmentary beginning we see that Fronto, who thought that history ought to be written "splendidly[6]," and felt the need of a great theme to inspire a great history[7], claims to have found such a theme in the exploits of Verus, exploits "such as Achilles would fain have achieved and Homer sung[8]"; and that he finds in Cato's *Origines*

[1] Quint. x. 1. 31: "est enim proxima poetis historia et quodammodo carmen solutum." But cf. Arist. *Poetics* IX. φιλοσοφώτερον...ποίησις ἱστορίας. Pliny comes nearer the truth in *Ep.* v. 8. 9: "habet quidem oratio et historia multa communia, sed plura diversa in his ipsis quae communia videntur. Narrat illa, narrat haec sed aliter." And cf. Beltrami, *op. cit.* p. 60.

[2] Cf. Chassang, *op. cit.* p. 98. [3] p. 203.

[4] Cf. Th. Schwierczina, *Frontoniana*, p. 17.

[5] Cf. p. 207, with Livy XXI. 4. Cf. Schwierczina, *op. cit.* p. 32.

[6] p. 126: "historia tamen potius splendide prescribenda est." (So Hauler reads in *Wiener Eranos*, 1909.)

[7] pp. 202, 203: "eorum profecto uberrima ingenia frustra fuissent, nisi magnifice se rebus scribendis occupassent."

[8] p. 202: "tantas res a te gestas, quantas et Achilles gessisse cuperet et Homerus scripsisse."

his ideal[1], and insists upon the supreme need in the historian of honesty and truth[2]. He is not the only historian who has fallen short of his own standard, and all this is not to be taken too seriously, for history is not Fronto's true bent. Yet there are two points which may be emphasized in common fairness: first, that his comparative worthlessness as a historian does not affect in the slightest degree his worth as an orator and rhetorician; and secondly, that in addition to definite information on various points, which he gives for the most part incidentally, he throws light for us upon the movements in philosophy, rhetoric and literature in his day. Though wanting himself in the historical sense, Fronto is not to be utterly despised by the historian who would understand the age in which he lived. "On reconnaît bien vite," writes M. Lacour-Gayet, the biographer of Antoninus Pius, "la valeur de sa correspondance intime pour la connaissance de la physionomie intellectuelle et morale de son époque[3]." It is not in the enumeration of facts[4] that the importance of these letters lies, but in the general picture which they give of life at the imperial court—an attractive picture, on the whole, for the second century, while far from being the millennium which it

[1] "Fandi agendique laudibus longe praestantissimus omnium Cato Porcius."

[2] Cf. p. 203: "namque ceteri mortales praesenti die mentiuntur; scriptorum mendacia tam culpam quam memoriam merent sempiternam."

[3] G. Lacour-Gayet, *Antonin le pieux*, Paris, 1888, introd. p. xv.

[4] It is to be feared that the dramatic picture of Caesar, writing the *de Analogia* in the thick of the Gallic war, is hardly to be accepted as strictly historical: "with the darts flying around him, he wrote on declensions; he wrote on breathings and systems of words with the blare of bugles and trumpets in his ears" (p. 221).

has been painted, was an age of much that was good. On this point Fronto confirms the testimony of Pliny[1]. It is the same society which the two describe, one giving us its beginnings and the other its latter years; and indirectly these letters help to establish the veracity of Pliny where Pliny is opposed to the morbid exaggerations of the moralist Juvenal. The simple life of Trajan at Centumcellae[2] is the same as that of Antoninus Pius at Lorium and at Lanuvium[3], and both seem to have wished to found "une sorte de royauté bourgeoise."

Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus are not the only characters of the age whose personality has been made clearer to us by these letters. In spite of the fact that Marcus Aurelius explicitly thanks Heaven for his wife[4], "so obedient, so affectionate, so simple," historians, following the gossip of Dio Cassius, Capitolinus[5], and others of their kind, have united to ruin the reputation of the younger Faustina. Here again, as in the case of Verus, the correspondence supports the judgment of

[1] Cf. G. Boissier, *La religion romaine*, pp. 169 ff. "La ressemblance des tableaux qu'ils nous ont laissés achève de prouver que, pour le fond, les deux peintures sont exactes."

[2] Cf. Plin. *Ep.* I. 14, II. 13, VI. 31, etc.

[3] Cf. Boissier, *La religion romaine*, p. 194, *Meditations* I. 16, and Fronto, pp. 66—70; cf. also p. 79, where Marcus writes: "ipse cum in cubitum irem, scorpionem in lecto offendi"; and p. 93: "tantum frigoris est in cubiculo meo, ut manus vix exseri possit." It is curious in this connection to note how simple and homely are some of the metaphors in the *Meditations*, e.g. *ib.* III. 2, where Marcus describes how the newly baked bread splits and how "these parts which thus open and have a certain fashion contrary to the purpose of the baker's art ..in a peculiar way excite a desire for eating."

[4] Cf. *Med.* I. 17, "I thank the gods that I have such a wife, so obedient, so affectionate and so simple."

[5] Cf. Capit. *vit. M. Ant. Phil.* ch. 19 and 29, and Dio Cass. LXXI. 31.

Marcus Aurelius, and relieves us from the necessity of having to imagine an intelligent Emperor blind to the vices of two of his household[1] or encouraging a "pious fiction." Verus was doubtless not all that he should have been, and Faustina may have been guilty of indiscretion. But "nemo est principum quem non gravis fama perstringat[2]" is a saying which applies also to Emperors' wives. The letters give us a very different picture from that of the historians, and, as Constant Martha truly says: "Tout lecteur qui prendra la peine de parcourir la correspondance intime et authentique de Marc-Aurèle et de Fronton, trouvera bien invraisemblables ou fort exagérés les récits que de plats historiens ont débités sur les désordres publics et scandaleux de cette mère de onze enfants, qui fût toujours si tendrement aimée par son mari[3]." It is quite possible that Marcus and Faustina were not kindred souls. Their marriage was primarily one of political expediency, and in Marcus' references to his wife in the letters there is nothing of the gushing affection which he pours upon Fronto. It may be that Faustina shared the scorn for philosophy which was felt by Avidius Cassius, with whom scandal coupled her name. But on the other hand, intimate as the letters are, there is never a breath of suspicion cast upon her character, never a hint that her presence and her life were the daily trial and mortification which Renan[4], for instance, repre-

[1] Marcus himself says that "the good and simple and benevolent show all these things in the eyes, and there is no mistaking" (*Med.* XI. 15).

[2] Capit. *vit. M. Ant.* ch. 15.

[3] C. Martha, *Moralistes de l'empire romain*, p. 212, note 1.

[4] Cf. Renan, *Marc-Aurèle*, ch. 26. It is unnecessary to take too seriously such a passage as *Med.* v. 10: "It is hardly possible to endure even the most agreeable of them (i.e. those who live with one), to say

sents them. Had it been so, one who knew the court life as Fronto knew it would hardly write: "I pray to the gods for Faustina every morning; for I know that I am praying and entreating for your welfare[1]"—implying, as the words do, that the welfare of Marcus was bound up with that of his wife. It was while following her husband on his eastern campaign that Faustina died suddenly at the foot of the Taurus, and lavish were the honours which he paid to her memory[2].

The elder Faustina, wife of Antoninus Pius, who has been handled even more roughly than her daughter, has also been placed in a new light by these letters, by the simple testimony of her husband himself: "By Heaven, I would rather live with her in exile than without her in a palace[3]." In the case of Antoninus Pius himself,

nothing of a man being hardly able to endure himself." Most people will understand the feeling, only most people do not write down the impressions of their bad days for posterity's comments, and consequently they escape the same dark conclusions as to the unhappiness of their family life. One can just as easily draw precisely opposite conclusions from e.g. *ib.* VI. 48: "When thou wishest to delight thyself, think of the virtues of those who live with thee."

[1] p. 83, "pro Faustina mane cotidie deos appello: *scio* enim me pro tua salute optare ac praecari" (Prof. Ellis would read *scis*). So, too, the account of Fronto's visit to the twins (p. 101) L. Commodus and Antoninus disproves the insinuation that Commodus was not Marcus' child.

[2] Halala, the village where Faustina died, was raised to the dignity of a colony, and a temple was consecrated to her there. Another temple on the Capitol was also built to her memory, and silver statues of Marcus and Faustina were set up by the Senate in the temple of Venus at Rome, with an altar on which brides and bridegrooms offered incense before marriage. Poor girls (the *novae puellae Faustinianae*) were reared in her memory, as they had been in memory of her mother.

[3] p. 164, "mallem mehercule Gyaris cum illa quam sine illa in Palatio vivere."

M. Lacour-Gayet[1], his biographer, recognizes to the full the value of the letters. This man, who was Marcus Aurelius' ideal[2], appears in these pages exactly as we picture him from Marcus Aurelius' account. Living a simple country life, in spite of his rank, we see him engaged in the pursuits of the chase, taking part in the festivities of the vintage, listening to the banter of the rustics, and enjoying the simple, country fare[3]. Fronto loved him dearly, and writes thus of his relations with him and Hadrian: "I regarded him (i.e. Hadrian) as a deity to be propitiated rather than as a man to be loved. Why? Because love is impossible without confidence and familiarity; since I had not that confidence, I did not dare to love him whom I so highly respected. But Antoninus I love and cherish as the sun, the day, life, breath; and I feel that my love is returned[4]." Writing again on the subject of holidays, Fronto describes how Trajan sometimes amused himself with actors and was a fairly hard drinker; how Hadrian loved music and feasting; and how even Antoninus, with all his virtues, took relaxation in the wrestling school and the theatre[5], and laughed at the jesters. It is easy to understand the popularity of this approachable, simple-minded man who was ready to let the Emperor be forgotten in the friend[6], who was "wont to stay in the same place and was not

[1] Cf. Lacour-Gayet, *op. sup. cit.*

[2] Cf. esp. *Med.* I. 16 and VI. 30 ("Do everything as a disciple of Antoninus").

[3] pp. 68—70.

[4] pp. 25, 26.

[5] p. 226, reading (with Cornelissen) "theatrum introiit" for "hamum instruxit" of the codex.

[6] Cf. Capit. *vit. Ant. Pius*, ch. 11, "frequentavit et ipse amicorum suorum convivia."

fond of change," whose disposition was "to keep his friends and not be soon tired of them[1]."

The value of the evidence of the *Principia Historiae* is discounted, as we have seen, to a great extent by the fact that Fronto is pleading a cause and is intentionally heightening the reputation of Verus at the expense of Trajan and Hadrian. Nevertheless it contains some interesting touches, such as the familiarity of Trajan with his soldiers, whom he addressed by their camp nicknames[2], and his popularity at home[3]. Hadrian, who is compared to Numa, is represented as an eloquent speaker, a great traveller, but lax and indulgent[4]. Most interesting of all, perhaps, for the history of the times is the passage in which Fronto emphasizes the importance of games and theatres to the Roman populace and describes Verus as "knowing full well that the Roman people require two incentives to activity, food and spectacular performances; that the success of a government depends no less on the amusements which it offers than on the more serious needs which it supplies; that the empire, though it

[1] *Med.* I. 16.

[2] p. 205, "multos militum imperator suo quemque nomine proprio atque castrensi cognomine (et io)culari appellabat." Cf. Dio Cass. LXIX. 9. 5, Spart. *Vit. Hadr.* 21. 9.

[3] p. 210, "pacis artibus vix quisquam Traiano ad populum, si qui adaeque, acceptior extitit."

[4] p. 206 (I give Dr Hauler's reading of the text, from *Serta Harteliana*, pp. 263 ff.), "namque post imperatorem Traianum disciplina propemodum exercitus carebant, Hadriano et amicis cogundis et facunde appellandis exercitibus satis inimicis et in summa instrumentis bellorum. quin provincias manu Traiani captas variis bellis ac novo constituendas omittere valuit quam exercitu retinere. eius itinerum monumenta videas per plurimas Asiae atque Europae urbes sita, cum atra multa tum sepulchra ex saxo formata....uni omnium Romanorum principum Numae regi aequiperandus."

exposes itself to greater danger in neglecting serious concerns, opens a way for greater discontent by neglecting the amusements; that the people care more for shows than for public largesses; and that, while the poor may be satisfied by distributions of food, yet the entire mass of the people will always be discontented if deprived of their spectacular performances[1]."

In a pamphlet published at Münich in 1817 by Friedrich Roth[2], it is stated that the single new fact which we glean from Fronto consists in a reference to a Roman encampment in Britain, which he mentions in the *de Bello Parthico*: "In the reign of your grandfather Hadrian how many soldiers were killed by the Jews, how many by the Britons[3]?" Spartianus, in his life of Hadrian, says vaguely that "at that time the Britons could not be kept under Roman control[4]," and it is possible that a revolt was the cause of this encampment. "Ein Beweis mehr," concludes Roth, "dass die Unterworfenen noch nicht so zahm waren als man sie gewöhnlich vorstellt." He compares with this the revolts with which Hadrian had to deal in Lycia, Egypt and Palestine, Antoninus Pius in Achaia and Egypt, and Marcus Aurelius in Gaul.

The fact that large numbers of provincials were by this time sitting in the Roman Senate is confirmed by Fronto's answer to his fellow-townsmen of Cirta, who had

[1] p. 210. Translation by P. B. Watson (in his *Life of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus*).

[2] Friedrich Roth, *Bemerkungen über die Schriften des M. Cornelius Fronto*, Münich, 1817, p. 5, note 1.

[3] pp. 217, 218.

[4] Spart. *Vit. Hadr.* 5, "Britanni teneri sub Romana ditione non poterant."

asked him to become their patron: "there are many other famous men of Cirta in the Senate[1]"; while the letter supporting the claims of Volumnius to the decurionate[2] (according to Niebuhr "der wichtigste der ganzen Sammlung") indicates that the office which was later so bitterly hated was at this time still eagerly coveted.

Recently, too, a fresh point of interest in the letters has been brought to light by Dr Hauler[3], whose reconstruction of p. 126 of Naber's edition not only gives us new information concerning the letter of Catulus to the Senate, to which Cicero refers in the *Brutus*[4], but also mentions the *Consilia* of Asinius Pollio, about which nothing was previously known. According to Dr Hauler's reading of the manuscript, Fronto, after commenting upon the brevity of various famous despatches to the Senate—such as the Sicilian despatch of Nicias (in Thucydides), that of Mithridates to Arsaces (in Sallust), or the letters of Pompey about the pay of his troops and of Adherbal besieged in Cirta, none of which attempted in any way to describe the circumstances of the situation—compares the Armenian despatch of Verus rather to the letter of

[1] p. 201.

[2] p. 192. Cf. Plin. *Ep.* x. 113 (the first mention of the decurionate being made compulsory). For an account of this office and the burdens which it involved cf. Smith, *Dictionary of Classical Antiquities*, pp. 606 ff.

[3] I am greatly indebted to Dr Hauler for sending me a copy of the *Sonderabdruck aus Wiener Eranos*, 1909, in which he deals with this point. It is from his pamphlet and Jordan's article in *Hermes* VI. (*inf. cit.*) that most of what follows is taken.

[4] Cic. *Brut.* 132, "quae (incorrupta quaedam Latini sermonis integritas) perspici cum ex orationibus eius potest, tum facillime ex eo libro quem de consulatu et de rebus gestis suis conscriptum molli et Xenophonteo genere sermonis misit ad A. Furium poetam, familiarem suum."

Catulus, "in which in the manner of a historian he unfolded all that he had done, fraught with loss and disaster, yet deserving a triumph[1]." Jordan[2] had already concluded that this "liber de consulatu et de rebus suis gestis" to which Cicero refers was a political pamphlet in epistolary form, like the letter of Cicero to Pompey, mentioned in the *pro Sulla*[3], or the long letter to Quintus *de petitione consulatus*[4], and that it was not intended for the poet Furius alone (to whom it was addressed). This view is supported by the text. "Der wahre Addressat war wohl das grössere römische Publikum" says Dr Hauler. "Freilich, ob die Schrift aus einer Art Rechenschaftsbericht an den Senat erwachsen ist, scheint auch mir zweifelhaft, da die folgende Wendung Frontos 'si ad Senatum scriberetur, etiam caute' gegen eine solche Annahme spricht[5]."

Further, these "res gestae," which Cicero mentions as part of the subject of Catulus' letter, had been understood previously to refer to his exploits *after* his retreat, in the year of his proconsulate and of his victorious co-operation with Marius at Vercellae in B.C. 101; but we now see

[1] p. 126, "in hunc autem modum, quo scripsisti tu, extant Catuli litterae, quibus res a se iacturis atque damnis gestas, at lauro merendas histo(rici exe)mplo exposuit; ve(rum) turgent elate (p)rolata teneris prope (v)erbis. historia tamen potius splendide perscribenda: si ad senatum scriberetur, etiam caute."

[2] H. Jordan, *Der Brief des Quintus Catulus de consulatu suo* in *Hermes* VI. pp. 68 ff. H. Peter (in *Fleckeis. Annal.* CXV. pp. 751 f.) combats this view.

[3] Cf. Cic. *pro Sulla* 67, "epistulam meam...quam ego ad Pompeium de meis rebus gestis et de summa republica misi."

[4] This letter is called by the Schol. Bob. in Cic. *or. pro Plancio* 34, "epistula voluminis instar."

[5] Hauler, *op. cit.* p. 220.

from this passage that they refer to disastrous events of the previous year, B.C. 102, the year of his consulship[1]. As to the style of the letter, Dr Hauler points out that the words "in hunc autem modum quo scripsisti tu" imply that it was written in Latin[2] and not in Greek, as Peter supposed[3]; it was obviously bombastic ("turgent elate prolata"); and the words "teneris prope verbis" confirm Cicero's "molli et Xenophonteo genere sermonis."

Of the *Consilia* of Asinius Pollio we have no other information except this passage, where we read that "if Asinius Pollio had written his celebration of his own policy in epistolary form, a form which necessarily entails greater conciseness, rapidity and compactness, he would have improved any occasional want of finish in his reply[4]". Asinius Pollio, after fighting for Caesar and Antony in the civil war, had assumed a neutral position, and the *Consilia* would seem to have been a reply[5] to a charge brought against him by one or other party, in which he defended this policy of neutrality. It was probably a separate composition, not a part of the Histories or the Speeches[6], and not, properly speaking, "history" at all,

[1] Hauler, *op. cit.* pp. 217—219. [2] *ib.* pp. 219, 220.

[3] H. Peter, "Der Brief in der röm. Literatur," *Abh. d. philol. hist. Cl. d. k. sachs. Ges. d. Wiss.* 1903, p. 243.

[4] "Pollio Asinius iubilatus Consiliorum suorum, si in formam epistulae contulisset, necessario brevius et expeditius et densius, si quod interdum respondit inornatius, scripsisset melius." For the title *Consilia*, cf. Cic. *de consiliis suis*, and Dio Cass. xxxix. 10. 2, *βιβλίον...περὶ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ βουλευμάτων*. For a discussion of the style of Asinius Pollio cf. J. H. Schmalz, *Über den Sprachgebrauch des Asinius Pollio*, Münich, 1890: cf. also his letters to Cicero (*ad Fam.* x. 31—33) and Sen. *Ep.* 100. 7: "Pollonis Asinii salebrosa et exsiliens, et, ubi minime exspectas, relictura (compositio)"; with which cf. "si quod interdum respondit inornatius," *sup. cit.*

[5] Cf. *respondit* in the text. [6] Hauler, *op. cit.* p. 223.

although handled in the historical manner. In Fronto's judgment it was more suited for compression into epistolary form. The passage is interesting as being our sole piece of evidence for a work otherwise unknown. "Der vielbespöttelten, aber aus der Zeitströmung unschwer erklärlichen Vorliebe Frontos für die ältere Literatur verdanken wir somit auch die Erhaltung näherer Nachrichten über das zu Ciceros Zeit fast schon verschollene Schreiben des Catulus und über Pollios *Consilia,* von denen uns sonst jede Kunde fehlt[1]."

[1] Hauler, *op. cit.* p. 224.

CHAPTER VIII.

FRONTO'S OPPOSITION TO PHILOSOPHY.

THE feud between rhetoric and philosophy arose from mutual jealousy and has been fostered ever since by mutual misunderstanding. The rhetorician and the philosopher have no point of contact; each is to the other essentially a trifler and each sees in the other's system nothing but idle talk[1]. As Gaston Boissier says of Fronto: "Par un étrange renversement d'idées, l'homme sérieux pour lui, c'est le rhéteur, l'amuseur public et le diseur de riens, c'est le philosophe." The feud had not yet arisen in the days of Cicero, who combined the two professions and regarded both philosophy and eloquence as necessary to an educated man[2]. But by the days of Quintilian

[1] Cf. Boissier, *Religion romaine*, Vol. II. pp. 112, 113, "Les philosophes et les rhéteurs avaient toujours été ennemis les uns des autres, mais les arts qu'ils enseignaient finirent par s'entendre assez bien ensemble. Cicéron et Quintilien (cf. XII. 2) avaient cherché à introduire la philosophie dans l'éloquence: après eux, ce fut plutôt la rhétorique qui entra dans la philosophie. Toutes les deux s'empruntent leurs procédés, et traitent des questions semblables. Elles s'adressent au même public et cherchent à lui plaire de la même façon. La rivalité entre elles, s'il en reste, n'est plus qu'à la surface."

[2] Cf. Cic. *Orator* 4. 14—16, "nec latius nec copiosius de magnis variisque rebus sine philosophia potest quisquam dicere." Cf. *ib.* 34. 119. Cicero, however, distinguishes clearly between oratorical and philosophical eloquence. Cf. *Orator* 62—68.

philosophers and rhetoricians had become two distinct classes, each claiming to provide for the young the ideal training for life. Nevertheless, although philosophy was no longer content to be merely a propaideutic to eloquence, and rhetoric was only too ready to show that she could stand alone[1], the curious feature of this hostility between them is that it is difficult to distinguish a philosopher like Taurus from a "little rhetorician[2]" like Aulus Gellius, as regards the subjects which they handled in conversation and their manner of treatment; while Favorinus, Fronto's philosopher-friend, was also a grammarian, a scholar and a student of the old Latin authors like Fronto himself. For philosophy no longer despised erudition; indeed, she had perforce to have recourse to rhetoric itself in order to embellish her hackneyed subjects[3].

Fronto laid no claim to the philosophic temperament. His intensely practical mind rejected as useless that which he could not understand[4], while his literal interpretation of Stoicism on its ideal side could only confirm him in his opinion that it was absurd. He is ready to believe—so he assures Marcus—that the wise man may be happy while burning in the bull of Phalaris, but he ventures to doubt whether even the wise man could evolve an epigram during the process[5]. His common-sense would prefer the

[1] Cf. Apul. *Flor.* I. 9, "disciplina, regalis tam ad bene dicendum quam ad bene vivendum reperta."

[2] Cf. Aul. Gell. XVII. 20.

[3] Cf. Boissier, *op. cit.* p. 112, "L'enseignement philosophique est réduit à n'être plus qu'un assaut de beau langage."

[4] I cannot agree with Beltrami (*op. cit.* p. 20) that Fronto regarded philosophic culture as necessary to the rhetorician. He seems to me utterly to despise it.

[5] p. 184. Fronto's attitude to philosophy is sometimes not unlike that of Tacitus. Cf. *Agric.* 4, and the story of Musonius Rufus in *Hist.* III. 81.

swiftness of Achilles to Philoctetes' lameness; yet it is forbidden to the philosopher to desire good health, or anything else which is fortune's gift[1]. He can see nothing but waste of time in the study of the various forms of sophistical arguments, to the neglect of "the embellishment and seriousness and majesty and charm and splendour of speech[2]." Philosophy is, in fact, to him, but "the wrangling of pretentious quibblers, intent on hairsplitting or fence of words, and with no power to guide the reason or to touch the heart[3]."

It is the *de Eloquentia* which contains Fronto's fullest and bitterest indictment of philosophy; and indeed, when a dearly loved and promising pupil, who, as future Emperor, might do much for the cause of rhetoric, goes over to the enemy's camp and refuses to exercise his oratorical talents, small wonder that the master loses his temper. "To you, Caesar," he cries, "as to none other, have the gods given talents lofty and great and splendid; for I knew your earliest thoughts and the very cradle of your studies[4]." He can find only one reason for the change. The paths of rhetoric are hard to tread: it is in weariness of introduction and narrative, of division, arrangement and proof, of synonyms and metaphors[5] that Marcus has taken to attending the philosophy classes which Fronto thus describes: "In the philosophers' classrooms you read a book; the master explains, while you follow in silence; you nod, to show that you have understood; while others are reading, you yourself generally

[1] p. 143. [2] p. 146.

[3] W. W. Capes, *The Age of the Antonines*, ch. 5. pp. 80 ff. Cf. also ch. 8.

[4] p. 150. [5] p. 150.

ooze, you listen to "Quid primum, quid secundum," counted over and over again; with the windows open, you hammer away at "Si dies est, lux est." Then you go peacefully home, with nothing to think over or write up at night, nothing to recite to your master, nothing to declaim from memory, no hunting out of words, no embellishment of synonyms, no translation from Greek into Latin[1]." It was perhaps the only time in his life when Marcus Aurelius was accused of laziness, and Fronto is quite conscious that he has lost his temper. "Now I am purposely going to wind up with a story," he ends, "so that, if I have said anything rather bitter, I may sweeten it by mixing it with a tale[2]."

Epicurus once said that it was easy to write, as no doubt it is, if one writes like Epicurus. It is this contempt for style on the part of the philosophers which arouses Fronto's bitterest sarcasm. Fronto, the phrasemaker, makes fun in his turn of their obscure, twisted phrases—"sermones proversos, retortos[3]"—and ironically urges that, if the conceptions of philosophy are really so lofty, they require suitable expression, since "the more splendid the sentiment, the more stately should be the language[4]." He even brings up the stock charge of inconsistency between principles and practice against the dialecticians[5],

[1] p. 154.

[2] p. 155. It is strange to find a recent writer saying of Marcus himself: "Certainly Fronto and Herodes the magnificent Athenian roused his enthusiasm for philosophy" (Alexander Graham, *Roman Africa*, p. 153). The same writer makes the equally extraordinary statement that Fronto belongs to "the long list of African writers who preferred to express themselves in Greek rather than in Latin" (*ib.* p. 301). *Vid. sup. ch. iv.*

[3] p. 148. [4] p. 148. [5] p. 144.

and though unable to deny their popularity—("you may see the rhetorician despised and unhonoured, while the dialecticians are courted and made much of in every way")—he suggests that the real reason for this popularity lies in the obscurity of their language, which only they can explain[1]. He is, of course, unfair to philosophy, which he ridicules as if formal logic were of its very essence. "If the study of philosophy had been concerned with things alone I should be less astonished at your utter scorn for words," he writes to Marcus, after the latter's defection. "But that you should learn ceratina-s and sorita-s and pseudomenus-es[2]—twisted and entangling words—while you despise the embellishment and seriousness and majesty and charm and splendour of oratory, proves that you prefer speech to eloquence, muttering and stammering to sound[3]." He reminds Marcus that the very philosophers, Chrysippus and Plato, have made use of all the weapons of rhetoric[4], and even stoops to compromise, pleading that, if Marcus cannot give his whole time to rhetorical exercises, he need not therefore abandon them altogether[5]. He is always ready with his jibe against all things philosophical. Writing on one occasion to Victorinus, for instance, about some will, he confesses that he was afraid that "philosophy might send things wrong[6]." Or again, congratulating Marcus on his restoration to

[1] p. 152.

[2] *ceratina* = the sophistical argument concerning horns (κερατίνα): "quod non perdidisti habes; cornua non perdidisti; habes igitur cornua." Cf. Gell. XVIII. 2. 8; Quint. I. 10. 5. *sorita* = the sophistical argument concerning a heap (σωρείτης, Lat. *acervus*). Cf. Cic. *Div.* II. 4. 11. *pseudomenus* = a false, sophistical species of syllogism.

[3] p. 146.

[4] p. 146. [5] p. 151. [6] p. 183.

health, he admits how anxious he has been—"though you philosophers may laugh at me"; for he lays no claim to Stoic tranquillity[1]. In a letter to Apollonides he speaks of the rhetorical education as the education for a man, though that of the philosophers may be suitable for gods, and urges Apollonides to help a certain Cornelianus as far as he can—"for he is a good fellow and a friend of mine—and no philosopher[2]."

But Fronto's opposition to philosophy has its roots deeper than prejudice and pique. In the letter written after the death of his grandson (the child of his daughter and Victorinus), in which he gives us the most intimate revelation of his own mind[3], he writes thus of the philosophic view of death: "But if death is more a cause for rejoicing than for grief to men, then the younger one dies the happier and more beloved by the gods ought he to be esteemed, seeing that he has laid aside the sooner the ills of the body and has been the sooner called forth to enjoy the functions of a free soul. Yet, though this be true, it makes little difference to us, who yearn for our dead; nor does the immortality of the soul afford any comfort to us, who all the days of our life miss our dear ones. The familiar pose, the voice, the figure, the free spirit—it is these we seek; over the face of the dead, so pitiful, we grieve—the lips tight shut, the eyes upturned, the hue of life everywhere fled. However surely it be established

[1] p. 80.

[2] p. 174. Fronto's attitude reminds one of Trimalchio, whose epitaph ran: "C. Pompeius Trimalchio Maecenatianus hic requiescit...pius, fortis, fidelis, ex parvo crevit, sestertium reliquit trecenties, nec unquam philosophum audivit." Petron. *Cena Trim.* 71.

[3] Cf. Hastings Crossley, *op. cit.* p. 64, "Bowed down by a real grief, all his affectations vanished and nature reasserted her sway." We may compare with this letter the opening of Quintilian's 6th book.

that the soul is immortal, this will be but the subject of a philosopher's discussion; it will never heal a parent's grief....No poet's verse, no philosopher's precepts, will so avail to soothe my daughter's pain and assuage her grief as her husband's words, springing from his dear heart, so closely knit to her own[1]." A philosophic proof of immortality is a poor substitute for the voice that is still. So again, in a letter of condolence to Herodes Atticus, he writes: "I will tell you how you may most easily find consolation—and I have learnt by experience and not by philosophy[2]." Philosophy seemed to him to be putting forward an extravagant claim as to the strength, security and self-sufficiency which she could inspire.

Useless, as Fronto thought, in his own case, philosophy was for the Emperor worse than useless. The practical duties of his position ought to have the first claim upon his time, and, as we shall see, of these practical duties the chief, according to Fronto, was rhetoric. "Imagine, Caesar," he cries, "that you can attain to the wisdom of Cleanthes or Zeno; loth though you are, it is after all the purple cloak that you will have to don, and not the philosopher's cloak of coarse wool[3]." For Fronto's opposition to philosophy is the natural outcome not only of his ideal of rhetoric but also of his conception of the duty of an Emperor[4].

[1] pp. 233, 234. [2] p. 144, *πείρᾳ μαθὼν ἔγωγε ἀλλ' οὐ σοφίᾳ.*

[3] p. 144.

[4] Cf. Capes, *op. cit.* p. 83, "To lecture his subjects on the duty of man, to award the meed of praise or blame, to animate to high endeavours in well turned period and graceful phrase—herein, he thought, lay the greatness of the ruler's work—not in policy, or law-making, or the rough game of war. The interests of humanity, therefore, were at stake, not personal ambition only, or the credit of his favourite study." *Vid. inf.* ch. x.

CHAPTER IX.

RELIGION.

Fronto's attitude to philosophy is easily determined, but we have far less evidence by which to study his views upon religion. He rarely discusses abstract questions of any kind; indeed he strikes one as the type of man who would never doubt or question at all, save under the stress of some great personal calamity. The old question—"If God is good, why do the good suffer?"—does not seem to have occurred to him until he met it in concrete form, with Victorinus and himself as the victims. Then he falls back upon a vague belief in providence, which nevertheless, like the consolations of philosophy, fails to satisfy him. "If providence governs the world, is this rightly 'provided'?" he asks. "Is there, then, to be no distinction between the fortunes of good and bad? Do not the gods or the fates discern the character of the man whose son is torn from his side? Some rascally scoundrel, who would have served the world better if he had never been born himself, brings up his children safe and sound, and at his death leaves them to survive him; while Victorinus, a man of such stainless life that it were well for the state that many such be born, has lost his darling boy. What

in the name of fortune is the providence whose provision is so unjust?" And then follows a sentence which has done Fronto's reputation more harm than anything else, save perhaps his criticism of Cicero: "They say that Fate is so called from *fari*, to speak; is this to speak correctly?" —which is followed by a few remarks upon the representation of fate in poetry. Cruttwell calls the whole letter "a mixture of desponding pessimism and philological pedantry." But surely this bit of etymology slips in with the utmost naturalness in the thoughts of a man who all his life long had dealt in words and their derivations. Yet Daunou writes: "Ce langage et ces discussions (note the plural) ne sont pas d'un homme bien profondément affligé[1]". One wonders if the French critic read to the end. "My wife I have lost, my grandson I have lost in Germany. Woe is me! I have lost my Decimanus. If I were made of iron, at this time I could write no more[2]." If an etymological reference is to be a proof of insincerity, many a passage in the *Meditations* is open to the same charge[3]. The only solution to the problem of undeserved suffering which Fronto can suggest is that apparent evil may be really good, since we are unable to distinguish good and evil, so that "in our ignorance we desire things which are evil as if they were good, and on the other hand shrink from things that are good as if they were mischievous." "That this is so," he adds, "I could more easily believe than that all human affairs are controlled by no providence at all, or by a providence that is unjust." Yet the belief which the

[1] *Journal des Savants*, 1816.
[2] p. 236. Cf. Dido in Verg. *Aen.* IV. 651 ff.
[3] Cf. *Med.* VIII. 57, IX. 10, X. 21, etc.

philosophers held that death is really a good, fails, as we have seen, to comfort him in his bereavement.

It is indeed remarkable to find such absence of religious fervour and enthusiasm in the first great writer of the African School—the school of Apuleius the mystic, of Tertullian, Cyprian and St Augustine and many another great Christian apologist[1]. It is true that Fronto says his prayers every morning[2]; Martial did as much—or as little[3]. He has a sublime confidence that the gods are as interested in the study of rhetoric as he is himself, and that they are on his side in the training of Marcus Aurelius in the true path[4]. But his confidence in the efficacy of their assistance is equalled, if not exceeded, by his confidence in the efficacy of Marcus' natural gifts[5]. He prays for his pupil, for Antoninus Pius, for his family, for his friends[6]; he thanks the gods for the recovery of those he loves from sickness[7] and is glad to learn that Marcus in his turn prays for him; for Marcus, he thinks, is the kind of man no god could refuse[8]. "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." Such phrases as *dis iuvantibus, dis volentibus*[9], occur frequently, but they mean little. It is the orthodox piety of a man who held himself aloof from the religious movements of

[1] For a study of religion in Africa cf. J. Toutain, *Les cités romaines de la Tunisie*, pp. 205 ff. and L. R. Holme, *The Christian Churches in North Africa*.

[2] Cf. p. 59, "pro Faustina mane cotidie deos appello."

[3] Cf. Mart. *Ep.* IV. 90.

[4] Cf. p. 55, "dii facient, dei favebunt."

[5] Cf. p. 95, "tam disertum quam voluisti ipse." Cf. also pp. 23, 99, 100, etc.

[6] Cf. pp. 4, 59, 79, 80, 83, 133, 167, etc.

[7] Cf. pp. 59, 79, etc.

[8] Cf. pp. 56, 79, 80, 88, etc.

[9] Cf. Tac. *Ann.* XVI. 33, *Germ.* 34.

his day, distrusting them partly because of a temperament intensely practical, partly because of their close connection with the philosophy which he abhorred, and partly, perhaps, from an ingrained respect for the past which made him an archaist in morals as in art.

The time in which he lived was a strange mixture of scepticism and faith and superstition. Boissier, in his "Study of Roman Religion from Augustus to the Antonines," sums up the difference between this and the preceding age by saying that Roman society had passed from incredulity to devout, religious faith[1]. Walter Pater, in *Marius the Epicurean*[2], gives a wonderful picture of this society, clinging to old forms and yet steeped in new philosophies. On the one hand the archaistic fashion in literature and art joined hands with patriotism in favouring a scrupulous observance of the ancient ritual; but on the other hand this official cult, while nominally unchanged, had undergone important internal modifications. It had been influenced, one might say revolutionised, by philosophy (and especially by Stoicism)[3], by mysticism, and by contact with foreign cults[4]. "On conservait les mêmes rites," says Boissier, "mais les croyances étaient changées; on allait dans les

[1] Cf. G. Boissier, *La religion romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins. Préface*; G. Lacour-Gayet, *op. cit.* pp. 364 ff.

[2] Cf. especially ch. ii. and ch. xxvii.

[3] For the hold which Stoicism took upon the Roman mind, cf. Rendall's Introduction to his translation of the *Meditations*, p. cxxviii. "Stoicism provided an intelligible theology and theocratic basis for the intricate mechanism of sign and formula and rite which natural magic had gradually riveted upon a simple, scrupulous and superstitious folk."

[4] For the legalisation of foreign cults at Rome, cf. Min. Fel. *Octav.* 22, "Aegyptia quondam nunc et Romana sacra sunt." Cf. Arnob. *adv. Gent.* VI. 7 (of Rome) "civitas omnium numinum cultrix."

mêmes temples qu'autrefois, sans y apporter tout-à-fait les mêmes sentiments; on priait les mêmes dieux, mais on avait d'eux d'autres ideés[1]." It was from all this that Fronto, like Plutarch[2] before him, held aloof.

But Fronto's royal pupil was a very different type of man. He was brought up to a punctilious and devout form of paganism[3], and never were the forms of ancient ritual more scrupulously observed than in his reign; but nature had endowed him with the dangerous combination of a speculative disposition and a singularly open mind. He seems to have accepted a variety of more or less contradictory beliefs without being able definitely to choose between them; and it is not given to many, as it was to Apuleius, to be at one and the same time philosopher and rhetorician, mystic and devotee, and to be them all whole-heartedly. Marcus, in some respects a consistent Stoic[4], is often vague. He hovers between atheism and pantheism, atoms and the universal soul[5]. He thanks the gods for all the good things of life[6] and believes in the efficacy of prayer; "On all occasions," he writes, "call on the gods[7]." His ideal prayer is the

[1] G. Boissier, *Relig. rom.* Vol. II. p. 413. Cf. *ib.* pp. 414 ff.

[2] It is interesting to note another resemblance between Plutarch and Fronto; cf. Gell. II. 9. 4, "nimis minute ac prope subfrigide Plutarchus... λεξιθηρεῖ." λεξιθηρία is the very centre of Fronto's doctrine of style.

[3] Cf. Jul. Capit. *vit. M. Ant. Phil.* 4.

[4] E.g. in his attitude towards the life after death. Cf. *Med.* III. 3, VIII. 58, XII. 36. There are none of those bright but visionary pictures which Seneca admits into the *Consolatio ad Marciam.*

[5] Cf. Nompère de Champagny, *Les Antonins*, p. 9 (a review of Boissier's *La religion romaine*).

[6] *Med.* I. 17.

[7] *Med.* VI. 23. For Marcus' views on prayer, see C. Martha, "Marc-Aurèle," in *Moralistes de l'Empire romain*, p. 195. Marcus prays for his friends. Cf. *Med.* X. 36.

Athenian petition: "Rain, rain, O dear Zeus, down on the ploughed fields and on the plains." "In truth," he says, "we ought not to pray at all, or we ought to pray in this simple and noble fashion[1]." Yet even in his most inspired moments doubts creep in. "Either the gods have no power, or they have power. *If* then they have no power, why dost thou not pray for them to give thee the faculty of not fearing any of the things which thou fearest, or of not desiring any of the things which thou desirest, or of not being pained at anything, rather than pray that any of these things should not happen or happen? For certainly *if* they can co-operate with men, they can co-operate for these purposes[2]." There is always an "*if*" at the back of it all, a lingering suspicion that perhaps after all the gods may not do anything, may not even exist. So it is with Providence: Marcus believes in some guiding principle behind things—but he is not quite sure. "*If* the gods have determined about me and about the things which must happen to me, they have determined well, for it is not easy to imagine a deity without forethought...but *if* they have not determined about me individually, they have certainly determined about the whole, at least...but *if* they determine about nothing—which it is wicked to believe, or *if* we do believe it let us neither sacrifice nor pray nor swear by them nor do anything else which we do as if the gods were present and lived with us—but *if*, however, the gods determine about none of these things which concern us, I am able to determine about myself[3]." "*If* there is a God, all is well, or *if* chance rules, do not thou also be ruled by it[4]."

[1] *Med.* v. 7.
[2] *Med.* ix. 40.
[3] *Med.* vi. 44.
[4] *ib.* ix. 28. Cf. xii. 14.

"Confidere dis debemus[1]," he writes to Fronto; resignation is still left—resignation and reverence[2], and the service of man, a life like that of Antoninus Pius, the "imitation of God[3]"; and amid all the temptations of the court and the distractions of a busy life he lived out his gospel in practice, although he never had the uplift of a clear and steady faith.

It is this vagueness of belief which gives us, perhaps, the clue to Marcus' attitude towards the Christians. It seems at first sight inexplicable that one who as a Stoic preached the brotherhood of man should strive to suppress those concerning whom even Lucian the satirist wrote that "their legislator had persuaded them that they were all brothers[4]"; and that one who was himself not far from the kingdom of heaven persecuted the Christian Church remains, as Renan says, one of the most tragic facts in history. This is not the place to discuss in detail this oft-disputed question. In spite of the decree favourable to the Christians, recorded by Eusebius[5], and in spite of the testimony of Tertullian[6], Lactantius[7] and Justin

[1] *ib.* p. 90.

[2] *Med.* XII. 5, 36; cf. *ib.* I. 16 and VI. 30: "Keep thyself then simple, good, pure...a worshipper of the gods;...reverence the gods and help men."

[3] Cf. Julian, *Convivium Caesaris*, 333 c: "Then Hermes, looking at Verus (i.e. Marcus Aurelius), said: 'And to you, Verus, what seemed the noblest end of life?' Quietly and gravely he answered 'The imitation of God'."

[4] Lucian, *Peregr.* 13.

[5] Euseb. *H. E.* IV. 13.

[6] Tert. *Apol.* 5.

[7] Lact. *de mort. persec.* 3, "secutisque temporibus, quibus multi ac boni principes Romani imperii clavum regimenque tenuerunt, nullos inimicorum impetus passa (Ecclesia), manus suas in orientem occidentemque porrexit."

Martyr[1], the evidence on the other side is overwhelming, and the persecutions of Lyons must be laid at the door of the Emperor. It may, of course, be urged that the plague and the general distress of the times caused popular feeling to run so high against the Christians that the Emperor was powerless to resist the tide. There is nothing more cruel than superstition moved to fear[2]. But although there were no martyrdoms in Rome itself, there is no evidence that Marcus attempted to prevent the existing laws from running their full course in the provinces[3]. The man with no settled convictions has never been able to understand the man who will die for his faith, and these Christians who *knew* in Whom they had believed seemed to Marcus to be merely "obstinate." "What a soul," he cries, "is that which is ready, if at any moment it must be separated from the body;...but so that this readiness comes from a man's own judgment, not from mere obstinacy, as with the Christians[4]." Faith cannot but seem "mere obstinacy" to the philosopher to whom "all is opinion[5]."

There are no references to Christianity in the letters, but we have other evidence that Fronto shared his pupil's views. In the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix[6] there is a reference to a speech delivered by Fronto against the

[1] Just. Martyr, *Apol.* I. 71.

[2] It is often urged that the Christians were commonly confused with the hated Jews; but from the time of Tacitus onward there is no evidence that any such confusion existed in the Roman mind.

[3] The laws apparently remained the same as in Pliny's day (cf. Plin. *Ep. ad Traj.* 96 and the reply). In quiet times they would be a dead letter.

[4] *Med.* XI. 3. [5] *ib.* II. 15, IV. 3, etc.

[6] Min. Fel. *Octav.* ch. ix. (quoted in Naber, p. 263).

Christians, containing the stock charges to which the sect was exposed. "Et de convivio notum est," says Caecilius, the champion of the old Roman religion in the dialogue, "et passim loquitur; id etiam Cirtensis nostri testatur oratio"; and he proceeds to describe the supposed conduct at a Christian feast. "Cirtensis noster" is certainly Fronto, who is mentioned in another chapter[1]. The speech is the earliest pagan attack upon Christianity of which we have any record, for in the first and the early part of the second centuries Christianity met with indifference and contempt at the hands of the educated, rather than with opposition. Its character is not known, but it cannot have been of very great importance, since this is the only reference to it. Boissier[2] suggests that it was probably not a great senatorial oration but a speech in a judicial suit, in which Fronto, having come into collision with some Christian in the courts, attacked the sect in order the more effectively to attack the individual. "Si Minucius Felix n'avait pas pris la peine deux fois de nous le dire," he adds, "nous n'aurions jamais imaginé qu'un homme comme Fronto, qui nous semble si occupé de sa rhétorique, si noyé dans les soucis futiles de beau langage, eût pris quelque part à des débats aussi sérieux." To judge by Caecilius' extract Fronto had certainly not studied the Christian doctrines deeply, for he charges the sect with atheism (the stock charge against those who, like Socrates, refused to acknowledge the official gods),

[1] *ib.* 31, "sic de isto et tuus Fronto non ut affirmator testimonium fecit."

[2] G. Boissier, *La Fin du paganisme*, vol. I. pp. 311 ff. Monceaux (*Hist. de l'Afrique chrét.* vol. I. p. 40) calls it "un grand discours," but there is no evidence as to its importance; cf. *ib.* p. 488.

with incest, and with the eating of human flesh[1], and lays himself open to the accusation of having spoken "like an advocate, not like a witness affirming a fact."

An attempt has been made to identify the Caecilius of the dialogue, obviously a man of letters, with Fronto, but the identification is disproved, not only by differences of style (for the *Octavius* is written far more carelessly than Fronto's letters, and is far more archaistic in diction), but also by the attitude of Caecilius to philosophy, which he treats with honour, and to Seneca, whom he imitates[2]. Fronto, as we have seen, detested philosophy, and Seneca was his *bête noire*. Caecilius expresses the point of view of the conservative and the patriot, who saw in the Christians merely a faction bent upon the destruction of a national institution hallowed by time and profitable to the life of the community[3].

It is hardly necessary to add that the responsibility for Marcus Aurelius' anti-Christian attitude has been laid at Fronto's door. There is not a particle of evidence for the charge, beyond these references in the *Octavius* to Fronto's *oratio*. And indeed the failure of Fronto's persistent efforts to alienate Marcus from philosophy suggests that his influence, even had it been employed in that direction, would not have availed for a moment against the Emperor's own judgment. To make Fronto

[1] It seems possible that this charge, which was often brought against the early Christians, may have arisen from misunderstanding of their language with regard to the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Cf. for example John vi. 53 ff.

[2] Cf. G. Boissier, *Fin du paganisme*, I. pp. 314, 315. Cf. also Schanz, in *Rhein. Mus.* 1895, pp. 120 ff., "Die Abfassungszeit des Minucius Felix."

[3] The line of defence which Caecilius takes up is very similar to that of the pontifex, Aurelius Cotta, in Cic. *de Natura Deorum*, *pass.*

responsible, even indirectly, for the persecutions of Lyons, on the strength of these two slight references to an otherwise unknown speech against the Christians, is to exceed the bounds of fairness and of common sense.

We have mentioned in passing the superstition of the age. That a mystic like Apuleius should believe in divination is natural enough[1], but it is strange to find superstition playing a part in the life of a man like Marcus Aurelius—in the incident, for example, of the Thundering Legion[2], when Marcus is said to have consulted an Egyptian sorcerer, or on the occasion when he had two lions flung into the Danube along with a great quantity of spices and offerings, at the bidding of the oracle of Alexander of Abonoteichos[3]. A belief in divination was not, indeed, inconsistent with Stoicism[4], and faith in dreams was a feature of the age[5]—a faith held by Plutarch, Pausanias and notably by Artemidorus, as well as by Marcus Aurelius, who thanks the gods that "remedies have been shown me by dreams, both others and against blood-spitting and giddiness[6]," and who speaks in another passage of the gods aiding men in all ways, "by dreams, by signs[7]." It is interesting to find

[1] Cf. Apul. *de deo Socr.* 17: "multa sunt de quibus etiam sapientes viri ad ariolos et oracula cursitant." Cf. *Apol.* 56, where Apuleius reproaches the people for not having a chapel or sacred wood, and for not offering sacrifices.

[2] Cf. Dio Cass. LXXI. 3. The story is denied by Xiphilinus.

[3] Cf. Lucian, *Alex.* 35. [4] Cf. Cic. *de Div.* I. 38.

[5] Cf. T. R. Glover, *The Conflict of Religions in the early Roman Empire*, pp. 225 ff. ("Dreams come into the scheme of things divine with all the devout of our period," *ib.* p. 226). Whole nights were spent in temples and sanctuaries, especially those of Aesculapius and Serapis, in order to learn cures in dreams. Cf. Paus. II. 27, etc.

[6] *Med.* I. 17. [7] *Med.* IX. 27.

confirmation of these passages in a birthday letter to Fronto, written before Marcus became Emperor, in which he invokes "all the gods who anywhere in the world...by dreams or mysteries, medicines or oracles, lend aid and rule supreme[1]."

[1] p. 47, "qui vel somniis, vel mysteriis, vel medicina, vel oraculis iuvant atque pollent." Cf. Capit. *vit. Ant. Pii*, 3: "somnio saepe monitus est dis penatibus eius Hadriani simulacrum inserere." Cp. Capit. *vit. M. Ant. Phil.* 5, etc.

CHAPTER X.

FRONTO'S THEORY OF ORATORY AND STYLE.

"*Cultum orationis et gravitatem et maiestatem et gratiam et nitorem.*"—*Fronto, p. 146.*

"*Regina rerum oratio.*" QUINT. I. 12. 18.

In order to appreciate the importance which Fronto attaches to oratory, and especially to oratory as an indispensable qualification for an Emperor, it is necessary to recall the position which eloquence held in the Roman State. Abroad no less than at home, in war no less than in peace, speech was the pivot of Roman life. In one of Boissier's books a passage from Tacitus' *Histories* is quoted in illustration of this point, in which Tacitus, who is describing a sudden assault upon the Roman camp, writes: "They attacked the camp so unexpectedly that Vocula could neither harangue his men nor draw them up in line[1]." The military harangue appears to have been as integral a part of the proceedings as the disposition of the forces. It was rhetoric, too, which really conquered the barbarians for Rome, and Tacitus thus describes Agricola's conquest of Britain: "He likewise

[1] *Tac. Hist.* IV. 33.

provided a liberal education for the sons of the chiefs, and showed such a preference for the natural powers of the Britons over the industry of the Gauls that they who lately disdained the tongue of Rome now coveted its eloquence....All this, in their ignorance, they called civilisation, when it was but a part of their servitude[1]."

So too when the Gauls were conquered, Caesar opened a school at Autun, where, under Tiberius, children of noble families studied grammar and rhetoric[2]; and it is a jest of Juvenal that even far-off Thule talks of having her rhetorician[3]. It is not surprising that the art which had made such great conquests for Rome did not seem to the Romans as trivial and frivolous as it does to us. The words "ut...eloquentiam concupiscerent" suggest that there was a fascination about this rhetoric, to which even the foreigner was susceptible; and as for

[1] Tac. *Agric.* 21: "iam vero principum filios liberalibus artibus erudire, et ingenia Britannorum studiis Gallorum anteferre, ut, qui modo linguam Romanam abnuebant, eloquentiam concupiscerent...idque apud imperitos humanitas vocabatur quum pars servitutis esset." Cf. *Hist.* IV. 64: "abruptis voluptatibus, quibus Romani plus adversus subiectos quam armis valent."

[2] Cf. Tac. *Ann.* III. 43: "nobilissima cum Galliarum subole liberalibus studiis ibi operata." Cf. Suet. *de ill. gram.* 3: "nam in provincias quoque grammatica penetraverat ac nonnulli de notissimis doctoribus peregre docuerunt, maxime in Gallia Togata." To know Latin was a necessity in the provinces for those who held official positions or who were Roman citizens. Cf. Dio Cass. LX. 17 (of the Emperor Claudius, who deprived of his citizenship a Greek who could not reply to a question in Latin): εἰπὼν μὴ δεῖν Ῥωμαῖον εἶναι τὸν μὴ καὶ τὴν διάλεξιν σφῶν ἐπιστάμενον. Cf. Suet. *Claud.* 16.

[3] Juv. XV. 112: "de conducendo loquitur iam rhetore Thule." The exception to this rule is Dacia, where no schools were founded, for the simple reason that the Dacians evacuated the district entirely, so that there was no necessity for latinising it. Cf. F. G. Mohl, *Introduction à la chronologie du Latin vulgaire*, pp. 257 ff. § 104.

"incorrigible men of letters," like Tertullian and St Jerome, though they might anathematise pagan culture[1] they never got over it. For them it had charms to which we are no longer sensible, but which few seem to have escaped and the reality of which it is all too easy now to forget[2]. Rhetoric has a bad name in these days, and the schools of declamation have had more than their share of ridicule. Yet they were but the necessary practice-ground of an art of which every speaker is, consciously or unconsciously, a votary. There is not a speaker in the House, at the bar, on the platform, or in the pulpit, who does not make his own "art of rhetoric"; and a branch of study which draws men out of themselves, which teaches them to observe and reflect and to express their thoughts, is not wholly to be despised. "If we lose eloquence," said Libanius, "what will remain to distinguish us from the barbarians[3]?"

Nor was the function of oratory less important at home than abroad to the Emperor, who was in Fronto's judgment the mouthpiece of the world[4]. "If you seek," he writes, "the true ruler of the human race, it is your eloquence which rules, your eloquence which sways men's minds; that it is which inspires fear, wins love, spurs to energy, crushes shamelessness, exhorts to virtue, represses vice, persuades, soothes, instructs, consoles[5]." "Empire is a title implying not only authority, but also speech; inasmuch as the authority of Empire is exercised in command and prohibition. Unless he praise good deeds, blame ill, exhort to virtue, deter from vice,

[1] Cf. Tert. *de idol.* x., Jer. *Ep.* 22 and 30.
[2] Cf. G. Boissier, *Fin du Paganisme*, pp. 300 ff.
[3] Lib. *Ep.* 372. [4] p. 145. [5] p. 122.

he belies his own name and is called Emperor for nought[1]." "It is the duty of Caesars," he says again, "to give expedient counsel in the Senate, to summon the people in assembly on business of many kinds, to amend unjust laws, to send dispatches continually throughout the whole world, to address foreign kings, to restrain by edicts the crimes of allies, to praise good deeds, check the disaffected, strike terror into the violent. All those things must be done, in very truth, by words and letters....You are mistaken if you think the opinion expressed by a Thersites will carry the same weight in the Senate as the speech of a Menelaus or an Odysseus[2]." Eloquence is surely preferable to speechlessness[3], and if one must fight with a sword, it makes a difference whether it be rusty or bright[4]. The informers of the preceding generation had dragged eloquence in the dust[5]; Fronto would fain see Marcus Aurelius restore to it something of the glory of its Republican days. For, though it was no longer a question of winning votes, Roman ears were still susceptible to the music of beautiful words, and the Emperor who could commend his policy to the populace in an eloquent speech was doing something to secure the peace-

[1] p. 124: "imperium autem non potestatis tantummodo vocabulum sed etiam orationis est," etc.

[2] p. 141.

[3] p. 142. Cf. Cic. *Orat.* 30: "composite et apte sine sententiis dicere insania est, sententiose autem sine verborum et ordine et modo infantia."

[4] p. 147. For his high ideal of eloquence cf. also p. 127, where he urges that it is more difficult and more powerful than the art of war—a variation of "the pen is mightier than the sword,"—and p. 146, where he insists upon its universal popularity among the gods.

[5] On these *delatores* cf. G. Boissier, *L'Opposition sous les Césars*, ch. IV. pp. 170 ff.

able acceptance of that policy. Rhetoric was still a power. "Since you know the art of speaking," said Libanius, "you know the art of commanding[1]"; and it is true of England, and even more true of France, that the governing class still consists to-day of those men "who know the art of speaking."

Given therefore the importance of oratory to his imperial pupil, Fronto's task was to perfect him in eloquence, and to this he gave himself unceasingly, with a sublime confidence in the support of heaven[2] and the genius of his pupil[3]. The lines on which he set about his task introduce us to one of the most interesting features of Frontonian criticism—his theory of style and the importance which he attached to the choice[4] and arrangement of words. For eloquence in his opinion depended almost entirely upon these two points, and it is this conception of eloquence as style which has drawn down upon him such a storm of hostile criticism. "Pour lui," writes Monceaux, "le fond n'est rien...on n'a vraiment à se préoccuper que de la forme; et en effet il n'est question que du style dans les traités de Fronton sur l'éloquence[5]."

It is true that Fronto has not that wide comprehensive conception of eloquence which characterised Cicero. Eloquence is not to him "copiose loquens sapientia[6]"; yet

[1] Lib. *Ep.* 248.

[2] p. 55.

[3] p. 97, etc. Cf. p. 95: "tam disertum quam ipse voluisti" and p. 100: "ita egregio ingenio natus es."

[4] Cf. the words of Caesar (ap. Cic. *Brut.* 72. 253): "verborum dilectum originem esse eloquentiae." Cf. Tacitus *Dial.* 22 (of Cicero): "primus et verbis delectum attulit et compositioni artem."

[5] Monceaux, *Les Africains*, Vol. I. p. 232.

[6] Cic. *part. orat.* 23. 79.

it is more than an art, for he expressly calls it an "officium[1]." And furthermore it may be urged that it was precisely the form, not the material, which was Fronto's business; he nowhere despises the latter, but as a stylist and rhetorician rather than a politician he devotes himself to the former. He himself pleads, in another connection, that a man should follow his own bent. "Would you bid me strive against nature," he cries, "strive, as men say, up-stream[2]?" It is his very appreciation of his pupil's lofty conceptions which fires him with a desire to give them worthy expression. "The one danger which threatened you, Antoninus," he writes, "was that which has threatened all men of lofty genius—the danger that you might halt in flow and beauty of language. For the more splendid the sentiments which are conceived the harder the task of clothing them with words: we must use every effort to secure that those lofty sentiments be not ill-clad, shabbily-girt, half-naked[3]." "The highest form of eloquence," he maintains, "is to speak loftily on high themes, simply on

[1] p. 141: "considera igitur an in hac secunda ratione officiorum contineatur eloquentiae studium." Cf. Cic. *de orat.* II. 9. 35: "Huius (i.e. oratoris) est in dando consilio de maximis rebus cum dignitate explicata sententia; eiusdem et languentis populi incitatio et effrenati moderatio; eadem facultate et fraus hominum ad perniciem et integritas ad salutem vocatur. Quis cohortari ad virtutem ardentius, quis a vitiis acrius revocare, quis vituperare improbos asperius, quis laudare bonos ornatius, quis cupiditatem vehementius frangere accusando potest? Quis maerorem levare mitius consolando?" etc.

[2] p. 113. It does not seem to have occurred to Fronto to apply this principle to Marcus Aurelius and his obvious bent for philosophy.

[3] p. 96. Cf. Archbishop Trench: "It is the first characteristic of a well-dressed man that his clothes fit him; they are not too small and shrunken here, too large and loose there. Now it is precisely such a prime characteristic of a good style that the words fit close to the thoughts."

lesser topics[1]." In other words style must correspond to matter—not, as Monceaux has interpreted his theory, supplant it.

In order, therefore, to convey the right effect the right words must be used in the right order. "You know," Fronto writes to Marcus, "how to seek words, you know how to arrange them aright when found, you know how to give a genuine tinge of age[2]." Vocabulary, arrangement, archaism—here in a single sentence are the main headings of Fronto's teaching.

The discussion of his archaistic leanings will be reserved until we come to discuss his literary criticism. Suffice it here to say that Fronto's archaism was not primarily the artificial affectation of the pedant, but rather the natural conclusion of his whole theory of style; for his aim throughout was to restore to Latin literature a rich and full vocabulary[3] such as it had possessed in the days of the old Republic, before the purism of Caesar and Cicero had made of literary Latin an artificial tongue which had lost all touch with daily life. He had, too, a deep "love and reverence for all ancient speech[4]" and a spirit like that of Holland: "If I have called again into

[1] p. 127. Cf. Cic. *de Orat.* II. 9. 101, "is erit igitur eloquens...qui poterit parva summisse, modica temperate, magna graviter dicere." Cf. Arist. *rhet.* III. 2. 1.

[2] p. 152.

[3] It is worthy of note that Quintilian, the most thorough-going of Ciceronians, is at one with Fronto in recommending the study of the old Latin authors, on the ground of their rich vocabulary and orderly sequence of thought. Cf. *Inst. orat.* I. 6. 39, 40. D. G. Rossetti writes in one of his letters that he has been reading early English ballads in search of "stunning old words."

[4] Cf. Gell. XIII. 28.

use some old words, let it be attributed to the love of my country-language[1]."

In order, then, to realise his aim, Fronto endeavoured to fashion an *Elocutio Novella*, which was to consist partly of the good old Latin words which had died out in the days of classicism, but which could be restored by study of the old authors, and partly of those newer words, which were in use in the language of common life but had hitherto been excluded from literature[2]. "To give fresh vitality to Latin," writes Mackail[3], "Fronto saw, and saw rightly, that the same process of literary genius working on living material must once more take place. His mistake was in fancying it possible to go back again to the second century before Christ, and make a fresh start from that point as though nothing had happened in the meantime." Nevertheless Mackail admits that the Frontonian movement "might have had important results, had outward circumstances allowed it a reasonable chance of development." And in fact a corresponding revolt against Classicism has had fruitful results in the literatures of other countries (notably in the Romantic movements of France, Germany and England, to which the Frontonian

[1] Cf. Holland, Introduction to his Translation of Suetonius.

[2] Cf. pp. 139, 140: "verborum omnium, ut ita dixerim, *de populo*, sicut in bello ubi opus sit legionem conscribere, non tantum voluntarios legimus, sed etiam latentis militari aetate conquirimus." It is in this introduction of popular words into the literary language that Fronto parts company from his fellow-archaist Aulus Gellius, who never uses a vulgar expression except by accident (cf. XVI. 74, XVII. 2. 21, *sordida verba*), utterly oblivious of the fact that much that was best and freshest in the old Latin authors they had themselves picked up in the streets.

[3] J. W. Mackail, *Latin Literature*, p. 235.

revival may in some of its aspects be compared)[1], and in spite of all the forces directed against literature in the years that followed it was "this new Latin produced by a set of Africans[2]" (including Fronto "a past-master in every kind of pedantry" and "the ridiculous and impossible Apuleius") which kept literature alive, and by its bold incorporation of living, popular speech called the dying language into new life[3]. Comparetti urges that "a final style[4]" had been discovered by Cicero and the Augustans for prose and poetry—with the ceaseless (and ineffectual) reproduction of which Roman literature ought, apparently, to have been henceforth content. Yet surely no living language can ever find a "final style"; finality and achievement are stagnation and death in literature as in life. "In truth," says Walter Raleigh, "the Romantics are right, and the serenity of the classic ideal is the

[1] Cf. Monceaux, *op. cit.* p. 237: "Pour en justifier l'usage (i.e. of popular terms) Fronton procéda exactement comme nos romantiques; il remonta aux vieux auteurs, dont le langage, moins épuré, était aussi plus riche." Greenough and Kittredge speak of the English eighteenth century romantic movement in words which might be a description of the Frontonian revival: "obsolete and half-obsolete words were revived... variety and striking effects were sought after. Metaphor became bolder and versification was freed from some of its more recent shackles (*Words and their ways in English speech*, p. 123. On the last point see pp. 110 ff. *inf.*). Cf. Walter Raleigh, *Style*, p. 37: "The Romantics... furbish up old words and weld together new indifferently, that they may possess the machinery of their speech and not be possessed by it."

[2] D. Comparetti, *Vergil in the Middle Ages*, trans. by E. F. M. Benecke, London, 1908, p. 46.

[3] Cf. Monceaux on the language of Tertullian: "La langue dont il se sert n'est pas une langue fixée, arrêtée dans sa croissance, aux racines stériles, comme l'était depuis longtemps le latin classique; c'est au contraire une langue en mouvement et en travail, aux racines fécondes." (*L'Afrique Chrétienne*, vol. I. p. 446.)

[4] Comparetti, *op. cit.* p. 38.

serenity of paralysis and death...inanity dogs the footsteps of the classic tradition, which is everywhere lackeyed, through a long decline, by the pallor of reflected glories.... This is the error of the classical creed, to imagine that in a fleeting world, where the quickest eye can never see the same thing twice and a deed once done can never be repeated, language alone should be capable of fixity and finality....Immutability is their ideal (i.e. of the classicists), and they find it in the arms of death[1]." There is nothing in the Frontonians so pedantic as the pedantry of the purists, who, like Caesar, would "shun every strange, unusual word like a rock[2]," or, like Cicero, employ a lengthy circumlocution rather than use a word (such, for example, as *beatitudo*) truly Latin, yet for some reason hitherto unused in literature. Cicero's style is "final" in the sense that it exhibits perfectly the resources of the Latin language at a particular stage of its development; but with further developments came the need for growth and change, even at the sacrifice of perfection: "nihil crescit sola imitatione[3]."

The avowed stylist has always been the victim of that suspicion which has proved the curse of so much literary criticism, the suspicion that he has nothing to say; whereas the truth often is that he has something so much worth saying that he takes the trouble to say it in the best way. To be interested in the niceties of grammar and style does not necessarily imply want of practical ability; witness Caesar, whose *de Analogia* was written during the Gallic campaign. Yet in Rome especially this suspicion pre-

[1] Walter Raleigh, *op. cit.* pp. 39, 40.
[2] Quoted from the *De Analogia*, in Gell. I. 10.
[3] Quint. x. 2. 8.

vailed. "Art for art's sake" was never a Roman motto, least of all in the field of oratory. "The Roman mind," says Jebb, "did not instinctively conceive the public speaker as an artist. It conceived him strictly as a citizen, weighty by piety and years of office, who has something to say for the good of other citizens, and whose dignity, hardly less than the value of his hearers' time, enjoins a pregnant and severe conciseness[1]." The elder Seneca tells us of a certain Albucius Silus[2] who mixed vulgar words in his oratory "so as not to seem a mere stylist." "Seek what to write, not how[3]," said the younger Seneca; and again, "Let not our words please, let them profit[4]." Not that he meant to imply that the two results are mutually exclusive—a theory not without its adherents; nevertheless, while approving such beauty of style as may come naturally to an author, he regards the intentional pursuit of style as necessarily involving some sacrifice of subject-matter[5], and as unworthy of any serious writer.

It is precisely the unreasonableness of this position which Fronto attacks. "Tell me, please," he asks, "supposing choice words should come to my hand of their own accord, without any toil or zeal on my part, think you I ought to spurn and reject them? Then do you prevent me from seeking out choice words with toil and zeal, since,

[1] R. C. Jebb, *Attic Orators*, II. p. 446.

[2] Sen. *Controv.* VII. pref.

[3] Sen. *Ep.* 100. 5.

[4] Sen. *Ep.* 75. 5.

[5] Cf. Warner (Preface to *Albion's England*, 1589) on the Euphuists: "onely this one error may be thought hatching in our English, that to runne on the letter we often runne from the matter, and being over prodigall in similes we become less profitable in sentences and more prolixious to sense."

if they come uninvited and without any summons on my part, you bid me admit them[1]?" In other words, if a thing is good, why not seek it? Why wait, as he says in another place, gaping and open-mouthed, till the right word drops on your tongue of its own accord, "as a Palladium rains down from heaven[2]?" Since thought must find expression in words, let those words be the best, and let the ranks be reinforced by conscription—"latentia eliciemus[3]."

Novelty, too, is good. Fronto praises Marcus for introducing the figure *παράλειψις* at the beginning of a speech, a position which that particular figure did not usually occupy, and adds "I am sure you will introduce many other excellent innovations in your speeches[4]." Neologisms should however be avoided; the right of coining words (*ὀνοματοποιεῖν*) is the poet's privilege[5]. "Seek some word," he urges, "not invented by yourself —for that is quite absurd—but one that has been used agreeably, harmoniously and suitably[6]"—the "verba apta

[1] p. 114. [2] p. 140. [3] p. 140. [4] p. 100.

[5] p. 50. Fronto himself uses a considerable number of words not found elsewhere (cf. Klussmann, *Emendationes Frontonianae*, Excursus II.), but which in all probability occurred in old Latin authors. There is no evidence that he himself coined words, although "plautinotato" (p. 156, *sic em. Studemund*, "Plautino trato," *cod.*), *πολίτιαν* (*sic cod.* M. Haupt, in *prog. Berol. acad.* 1867, coniecit *πολίτειαν*, i.e. a hybrid form from "politus") may be instances of such coining.

[6] p. 162. Cf. Quint. 1. 5. 72: "Sed minime nobis concessa est *ὀνοματοποιΐά*," etc. The amount of neologism in Apuleius has been much disputed. Oudendorf and Ruhnken maintained that Apuleius wrote nothing "sine exemplo." But cf. Chas. Whibley, quoted in ch. XII. and Koziol, "Der Stil des Apuleius," pp. 249 ff. Cf. Beltrami, *op. cit.* p. 34: "non neologismi ma lingua commune finchè è possibile: la novità deve consistere in una maggiore respondenza della parola all' idea."

et propria et suo suco imbuta[1]" which the old authors employed. For "a new word must not have a counterfeit ring, but must be familiar by age, and yet charm by its novelty[2]." In this way we shall exchange "vulgar words for choice, degraded for new[3]."

Fronto blames Marcus for not giving to this *Elocutio Novella* sufficient prominence in one of his speeches[4], for in his eyes it is precisely in the choice of words that the superiority of the front-rank orator is displayed. "I rejoice above all," he writes on another occasion, "that you do not snatch at any words that occur to you, but seek the best. For this is the difference between a first-class orator and the common herd, that while the latter are easily contented with good words, the first-class orator is not content with good if there are any better[5]." Fronto is within measurable distance of the doctrine of "le mot propre" or "le mot juste," and in his definition of those "unexpected words" which he misses in Cicero that doctrine finds still clearer expression. "By an unlooked-for and unexpected word," he says, "I mean one which is used contrary to the thought and expectation of audience or readers; and it is such that if you take it away and bid the reader seek a word himself, he can find none, or at least none which expresses the meaning so well[6]." C. N. Smiley[7] has recently sought to connect this doctrine

[1] p. 161. [2] p. 140. [3] p. 151.

[4] p. 153: "nonnihil interdum elocutione novella parum signatum."

[5] pp. 98, 99.

[6] p. 63. Cf. Walter Pater (in *Appreciations*) of Gustave Flaubert's belief in "the unique word." "The one word for the one thing, the one thought amid the multitude of words, terms, that might just do: the problem of style was there."

[7] Cf. C. N. Smiley, "Latinitas and Ἑλληνισμός," *Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*, No. 143, 1906.

of the one right word with that upon which the Stoics laid such stress, that purity of diction (*Latinitas* or ἑλληνισμός) which according to the Stoic Diogenes was the chief virtue to be desired in a speaker or a writer[1]. He traces the influence of the Stoic theory of style through the Atticism of Cicero's day to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Quintilian, the younger Pliny, Tacitus, Fronto, Aulus Gellius and Sextus Empiricus. But *Latinitas*[2] was not the monopoly of the Stoics, nor is Smiley justified in attributing to Stoic influence the whole archaistic movement, simply on the ground that from the Stoic doctrine that speech must be in harmony with nature comes the harking back to the vocabulary of the ancients, whose language was nearer to the primitive and "natural" diction[3]. Fronto, indeed, expressly rejects the Stoic theory that the function of oratory is simply to teach[4], and to connect his praise of *brevitas*, for example, with the Stoic συντομία and his archaism with the Stoic doctrine of a return to nature is to forget that, far from being a Stoic, he was a practical orator and a stylist, insisting on conciseness because he knew the limits of men's patience, and preaching archaism because in the old Latin authors words were still living and fresh and rich in meaning.

The doctrine of the one right word not only depends upon words being, as Fronto puts it, "imbued with their own sap[5]," but also involves that appreciation of the delicate distinction between synonyms which has bewildered and fascinated mankind since the days of

[1] *ib.* p. 237. Cf. Diog. Laert. *Life of Zeno*, VII. 59.

[2] Cf. Fronto, pp. 101 and 28. [3] Cf. Smiley, *op. cit.* p. 240.

[4] Cf. Fronto, p. 146 (of Chrysippus): "num contentus est docere, rem ostendere, definire, explanare? non est contentus."

[5] p. 161.

Prodicus of Ceos[1]. In view of Fronto's attitude towards philosophers in general and Stoicism in particular, it is amusing to find that his favourite pursuit was inaugurated by the philosophers and brought to Rome, so far as we know, by Cato the Stoic[2]. Realising that, as Walter Raleigh says[3], "there are no synonyms," since "no two words ever coincide throughout their whole extent," Fronto writes, "I would not have you ignore the important difference which a syllable makes," and illustrates his theory by the various uses of *luere*, *linere* and their compounds[4]. Elsewhere he insists upon the difference between *dictio* and *oratio*[5], upon the precise use of *obsecro*[6], the distinction between *oculi convenientes* and *oculi concinni*[7], and the literal meaning of *cotidie*[8]. He complains that there are few who devote themselves to the laborious task of seeking words[9], and, while admitting that there is no law in these matters ("some fashion their words with a crowbar, others

[1] For the discussion of synonyms, cf. Gellius *pass.* e.g. XVI. 14 (properare and festinare); XIII. 3. 1 (necessitas and necessitudo); XIII. 25. 1 ff. (praeda and manubiae), III. 10. 2 (erraticas and errones), etc.

[2] Cf. Cat. *reliq.* p. 44, ed. Jordan: "aliud est properare, aliud festinare."

[3] Cf. Walter Raleigh, *op. cit.* pp. 46, 47.

[4] p. 64. [5] p. 78. [6] p. 99. [7] p. 159.

[8] p. 50. Cf. also p. 169 (where Marcus uses *fovere fauces* (= to gargle) in preference to *gargarissare*), p. 66, p. 149, etc. Cf. Quint. x. 1. 6.

[9] p. 62. It is precisely this seeking out of single words which Quintilian ridicules. Cf. Proem. Bk VIII.: "atqui plerosque videas haerentes circa singula, et dum inveniunt et dum inventa ponderant et dimetiuntur...quibusdam tamen nullus est finis calumniandi se et cum singulis paene syllabis conmoriendi, qui etiam, cum optima sunt reperta, quaerunt aliquid, quod sit magis antiquum, remotum, inopinatum." Cf. especially *ib.* § 27: "miser enim et, ut sic dicam, pauper orator est, qui nullum verbum aequo animo perdere potest." Cf. also his scorn for Atticism, *ib.* VI. 3. 107.

with a chisel"), he adds: "Nevertheless we, who have given ourselves to be slaves to the ears of the learned, must needs devote ourselves with the utmost care to these minute points of detail[1]." Nothing which can add to the beauty of the whole should be beneath the notice of the professed scholar; and if it be true that, as Hooker claims, "the mixture of those things by speech, which by nature are divided, is the mother of all error," then the distinction between synonyms becomes more than an elegant mental accomplishment and intellectual gymnastic, inasmuch as it is allied to truthfulness itself. "I learn the truth from you," wrote Marcus to his tutor. To call things by their right names is after all a branch of truth, and it is sometimes from want of an exact and clear expression that a concept becomes blurred. "Words are grown so false," says the clown in Shakespeare, "that I am loth to prove reason with them." "L'art d'écrire exige tant d'autres acquisitions!...Il ne faut pas mépriser les mots, car ils portent d'idées[2]." For to call things by their right names is not to mistake words for realities; it is to keep clear the distinction between different realities. Fronto's scrupulous care for words is illustrated by the five scenes in which he appears in Aulus Gellius' *Noctes Atticae*[3].

[1] p. 65.

[2] E. Jullien, *Les professeurs de littérature de l'ancienne Rome*, p. 363. Cf. Constant Martha (on "La moralité dans l'art," in *Rev. d. d. Mondes*, Ap. 1879, pp. 854 ff.): "Nous ne pouvons pas penser sans jeter nos idées dans ces moules tout faits (i.e. words): s'ils sont nobles, nous pensons noblement; s'ils sont fins, nous pensons finement. Une langue est un trésor de délicatesses accumulées par le temps; si elle se gâte, l'esprit public se gâtera avec elle; si elle perd sa précision et sa justesse, les idées seront moins justes et moins précises; si elle s'épaissit, les sentimens seront plus grossiers."

[3] Cf. Gell. II. 26, XIII. 28, XIX. 8, 10, 13.

The discussion invariably turns upon some linguistic point, and although the talk may begin with the estimates for a new bath, it soon drifts into an enquiry into the uses of *praeterpropter*[1].

There could be no more eloquent defence of Fronto's λεξιθηρία, "la chasse aux syllabes," than the two chapters in Walter Pater's *Marius the Epicurean*, entitled "Euphuism" and "A pagan end." That Fronto figures in that book as a Stoic philosopher in no way affects the case. Pater (in language which is itself a justification of his position) developes Fronto's theory of the preciousness of words, and defends this "Roman Euphuism[2]," this "scrupulousness of literary art." "Latin literature," he says, "and the Latin tongue were dying of routine and languor, and it was necessary first of all to re-establish

[1] Cf. Gell. XIX. 10. Cf. also *ib.* XIII. 25 ff. (where Gellius and his friends discuss the meaning of the words on the public inscriptions during their walk), III. 19. 1 (where the etymology of *parcus* is discussed at the dinner-table), IV. 1. 1 (where similar etymological discussion takes place while Favorinus and his friends wait in the vestibule of the palace to greet the Emperor), etc., etc. Cf. IV. 1. 18: "civibus Romanis Latine loquentibus rem non suo vocabulo demonstrare non minus turpe est, quam hominem non suo nomine appellare."

[2] It is curious to find Lyly, too, called "a second Cicero"—"alter Tullius Anglorum." The resemblances between Euphuism and the Frontonian theory of style are striking. Alliteration, emphasis, antithesis, artificiality and a lucidity largely due to short sentences are common to both. In J. D. Wilson's *John Lyly* (Cambridge, 1905, pp. 43 ff.) Euphuism is connected with the Renaissance, as being a product of humanism with parallels in Italy, Spain and France, and not the result of international borrowings from Spain or elsewhere. J. D. Wilson notes (p. 14) that it was Dr Weymouth (in *Phil. Soc. Trans.* 1870, 2) who first discovered that "beneath the courtezan-like painted affectation of Euphuism there lay a definite theory of style and a consistent method of procedure," and attributed to the Euphuists the introduction for the first time of the principle of design into prose, and the attacking of the problem of prose style.

the direct relationship between thought and expression, between the sensation and the term, and to restore to words their primitive power[1]." In those chapters in which he describes the awakening in Flavian of "the literary conscience," it may seem that Pater implies more than can be substantiated by our text. Nevertheless the spirit is the spirit of Fronto, and, simply because in this case there have been so many to accuse and so few to defend, it seems worth while to give a brief extract from a chapter which can only be fairly appreciated in its entirety. "There might seem to be no place left"—so run the thoughts of Flavian—"for novelty or originality; place only for a patient, infinite faultlessness....Perhaps the utmost one could get by conscious effort, in the way of a reaction or return to the conditions of an earlier and fresher age, would be but *novitas*—artificial artlessness—*naïveté*; and that quality too might have its measure of euphuistic charm, direct and sensible enough; though it must count, in comparison with the generic early Greek newness at the beginning, not as the freshness of the open fields, but only of a bunch of field-flowers in a heated room." And again: "In a world confessedly so rich in what was ancient, the work even of genius must necessarily consist very much in criticism....The rhetorician was after all the eloquent and effective interpreter of what understanding himself had come by of the beautiful house of art and thought."

Nor is Walter Pater the only modern stylist and critic in whom one may find confirmation for Fronto's theory. I take the following quotations from John Addington Symonds' *Essays Speculative and Suggestive*; the close

[1] Cf. p. 161: "verba...suo suco imbuta."

parallelism between the language as well as the thought of the modern and the ancient critic is remarkable: "To be meticulous (as Sir Thomas Browne would say) in the adoption of new phrases and the resuscitation of old words is hardly less reprehensible than to be reckless in the ill-considered use of them. Justice of perception consists in knowing when and where to deviate from the beaten track....Style, in literature, may be roughly described as the adequate investiture of thought with language[1]. The best style is that in which no other verbal form could be imagined more appropriate for the utterance of thought than the one which has been given by the writer[2]....Many modes of expression for the same idea or emotion are possible. Yet that only one of them is the absolutely right one will be admitted by those who have seriously studied the problem of style[3]....Clear thinking is the first requisite of a good style....Better precise and bald lucidity than nebulous magnificence of diction[4]."

The arrangement as well as the choice of words constitutes an important element of style, for "many words in a speech become full of meaning or superfluous by changing their order[5]." Fronto illustrates this point by citing *navis triremis* and *triremis navis—navis* in the latter phrase being obviously unnecessary. So, too, words must not be placed irregularly in a speech, "as in a drunken, noisy banquet." One may double or treble them, or heap up four, five, or even more upon one another; but they must not be piled up carelessly without any point, and should come to a definite con-

[1] Cf. p. 96.
[2] Cf. p. 63, *vid. sup.*
[3] Cf. pp. 98, 99, *vid. sup.*
[4] Cf. p. 64.
[5] p. 65. Cf. also p. 153 and p. 139.

clusion[1]. Fronto praises Sallust for his arrangement[2], and congratulates Marcus Aurelius on "knowing how to arrange his words correctly when he has found them[3]." He fully admits the difficulty of marshalling one's proofs so that the connection between them is properly observed, and urges that they should not be piled up indiscriminately but "in such a way that the first sentence shall so to speak stretch out a flap and extend a border to the one that follows, so that the second sentence begins where the first ends; for in this way we shall appear to pass from one to the other instead of leaping across[4]." Yet with all his precepts he abhors the monotony of the faultily faultless ("variety even at some sacrifice is preferable to strict continuance[5]")—and with all his pursuit of the right word, all his zeal for finished arrangement, he insists upon the supreme necessity for clearness. "Let an orator be bold, but let him never swerve from the expression of his meaning[6]," is his maxim. If necessary, beauty of style must be sacrificed; "for it is far better to use common

[1] p. 139. Cf. *Amiel's Journal* for 18th July, 1877 (trans. by Mrs Humphry Ward): "Subject and occasion only must govern the use of words. Procedure by single epithet gives strength; the doubling of a word gives clearness, because it supplies the two extremities of the series; the trebling of it gives completeness, by suggesting at once the beginning, middle and end of the idea; while a quadruple phrase may enrich by force of enumeration."

[2] p. 153.

[3] p. 152: "scio reperta recte collocare."

[4] p. 212: "ita enim transgredi potius videbimur quam transilire." Cf. p. 211 (of rhetorical exercises): "Here...we have to endeavour to secure that nothing should be left inharmonious and badly connected, nay, that everything be *woven with borders and finished with edgings*, as in a fine robe."

[5] p. 212: "variatio etiam cum detrimento aliquo gratior est in oratione quam recta continuatio."

[6] p. 66.

ordinary words than far-fetched, strange language which fails to express the true meaning[1]."

For Fronto is nothing if not practical. Style and rhythm, he urges, should differ in different kinds of oratory. Thus in rhetorical exercises "one will seek out a number of maxims, packing them close together, linking them cunningly one to another, without dragging in many unnecessary repetitions, and then finish off the whole sentence shortly and skilfully. But in forensic speeches it is different; there we have to take great pains sometimes to end off several sentences rather harshly and roughly; but here, on the contrary, we have to endeavour to secure that nothing should be left inharmonious or badly connected, nay, that everything be woven with borders and finished with edgings, as in a fine robe[2]." For not only must the style match the subject; it must also be adapted to the audience. "Everywhere the people reigns supreme[3]; therefore do and say what will find favour with the people. Herein lies an orator's supreme and difficult achievement—to please his audience without any great sacrifice of true eloquence[4]." He describes in another passage[5] the delight of an audience in a well-turned phrase, and commends his pupil because when speaking in the Senate or in the Assembly of the people he never used any far-fetched word, any obscure or un-

[1] p. 64. *Vid. sup.* and cf. p. 22, "potius ut in compositionis structuraeque mollitia sit delictum quam in sententiarum impudentia"; sic em. Eckstein; cod. "instructuraeque...impudentia" p. m., "impudenti" alt. m., sic Brakman.

[2] p. 211.

[3] Cf. Cic. *Orator*, 8. 24: "semper oratorum eloquentiae moderatrix fuit auditorum prudentia."

[4] p. 21. Cf. p. 22.

[5] p. 159.

usual figure; "knowing that the eloquence of a Caesar ought to resemble the trumpet and not the pipes, which are harder to play, but give forth less sound[1]." "Fronton, lui, n'a jamais joué que de la flûte," is Monceaux's comment[2]. The fragments of Fronto's oratory which we possess seem hardly sufficient to justify such a sweeping statement.

Throughout the master insists upon the need for constant practice[3] and for patience. "You have only just begun to read ornate speeches of display; do not expect to be able to imitate them at once[4]." "If you give up the search (i.e. for words) you will never find them; but if you go on searching, you will surely find[5]." "If you want to write anything, write slowly[6]."

In spite of the wide reading in prose and poetry which he enjoins (the practical utility of which he illustrates by the case of Verus[7]), his view of education is the narrow, rhetorical view of Quintilian and Seneca[8], not the wide conception which characterised Cicero[9]. Fronto's ideal orator is the ideal of Cato and Quintilian[10], "vir bonus dicendi peritus," and the course of training which he proposes in order to secure this result is in most of its details the ordinary rhetorical education. He prescribes the making of excerpts[11], constant practice in prose-composition[12] and

[1] p. 40. Cf. *Med.* VIII. 30, "Speak both in the Senate and to every man whoever he may be appropriately."

[2] Monceaux, *op. cit.* p. 234. [3] p. 142.

[4] p. 55. [5] p. 65. [6] p. 26. [7] p. 128.

[8] Cf. Sen. *Ep.* 106. 12: "non vitae sed scholae discimus."

[9] Cic. *de orat.* 1. 6: "nemo poterit esse omni laude cumulatus orator, nisi erit omnium rerum magnarum atque artium scientiam consecutus."

[10] Cf. *Inst. Orat.* XII. 1; cf. p. 125.

[11] Cf. pp. 56, 105, 253, and 34. [12] p. 23.

in *sententiae*[1] and *controversiae*[2]. Of the use of figures of all kinds he thoroughly approves, for in his opinion they "especially embellish a speech[3]." Metaphor and simile he often recommends[4]; indeed he himself uses them so freely that we sometimes echo his own ἄλις εἰκόνων[5]. He prescribes also the handling of commonplaces[6], including proverbs and the stock mythological stories with morals[7], where these are suited to the style[8]. Special attention, he thinks, should be given to epideictic, as being the most difficult branch of oratory. Translation from Greek into Latin[9] he finds useful, as also the kindred exercise of paraphrase. "Turn the same phrase," he urges, "two or

[1] Cf. p. 48: "gnomas egregie convertisti, hanc quidem quam hodie accepi prope perfecte, ut poni in libro Sallustii possit." Fronto recommends their use (cf. p. 106). For examples of *sententiae* in Fronto cf. p. 206 ("nam cum in omnibus artibus tum praecipue in militari desidia noxia est"), pp. 207, 208 ("delicta sua plerique, dum ignorari putant, corrigunt; ubi manifesta sciunt, impudentia obfirmantur"); cf. pp. 59, 204, 209, 218, 220, etc. *Vid.* Beltrami, *op. cit.* p. 41.

[2] Cf. pp. 82, 83. Beltrami (*op. cit.* pp. 55, 56) notes that both are on historical subjects.

[3] p. 181. Cf. Cic. *Orat.* 20. 66 and cf. pp. 98, 99 (praise of Cato's use of παράλειψις), 66, 152, 157. He mentions especially the advantages of the Socratic irony (p. 52).

[4] Cf. pp. 46, 73.

[5] p. 239. For a list of his similes cf. Beltrami, *op. cit.* p. 39, note 9. Cf. Cic. *Orat.* 40. 138.

[6] Cf. pp. 92, 93, 8, 15 (on the seasons; cf. App. Verg., Priap. I. and II. Ovid, *Met.* II. 27—30, etc.).

[7] Cf. p. 51 (the story of Hero and Leander, cf. Ovid, *Her.* 18 and 19, Musaeus, etc.), pp. 218 ff. (the ring of Polycrates), p. 225 (the Halcyon), p. 58 (Orpheus), p. 238 (Sleep), p. 237 (Arion), p. 154 (the Vine and the Oak), etc. For a complete list compare Schwierczina, *op. cit.* p. 19, note. Cf. *inf.*

[8] p. 54. Cf. pp. 211, 212.

[9] Cf. p. 154. Cf. Plin. *Ep.* VII. 92: "utile in primis (et multi praeceperunt) vel ex Graeco in Latinum vel ex Latino vertere in Graecum.' Cf. Cic. *de Orat.* 1. 155, Quint. X. 5. 4—11.

three times[1]." He insists generally upon the importance of gesture and delivery[2], the advantages of brevity[3] and of such boldness as does not involve the sacrifice of the sense[4], and the dangers of superficiality. Half-knowledge, he argues, is as dangerous in rhetoric as in philosophy, for "self-distrust absolutely checks daring[5]." Fronto's ideal orator must be a finished artist.

In all this there is not much strictly technical instruction, except incidentally upon the use of εἰκονες[6] and one or two other minor points. "Quindi in Frontone noi troviamo tanto particolari precetti sopra la tecnica oratoria propriamente detta, quanto pensiero e massime generali sopra la natura, la qualità e l' importanza expressione artistica in ogni maniera di discorso," says Beltrami[7], one of Fronto's most recent and ablest critics.

Nor is there much that is new; indeed save for the importance which he attaches to the distinction between synonyms and to the study of the early Latin authors, with which we have already dealt, Fronto follows closely in the steps of his predecessors. The rhetorical pieces of display receive, perhaps, fuller treatment at his hands than before, for Fronto, while frankly recognizing their trifling character (he himself applies to them the name "nugalia[8]," "trifles"), considered them a useful propaideutic to higher branches of rhetoric, and thought it worth while to lay down rules for their composition, especially since, as he says, "no one has excelled in

[1] p. 48. Cf. p. 151: "ut veterum commata ut cola synonimorum ratione converteres, ut de volgaribus elegantia, de contaminatis nova redderes."

[2] Both are included under the one word *actio* (p. 18).

[3] p. 98. [4] p. 66, *vid. sup.* [5] p. 61.

[6] p. 46. [7] Beltrami, *op. cit.* p. 8. [8] p. 228.

them[1]." These "nugalia" have something in common with the parody (which, as we shall see in connection with his criticism of Seneca, was also one of Fronto's weapons) and were common exercises in the rhetorical schools[2]. Fronto illustrates the rules which he lays down by examples of his own—the Panegyrics upon "Sleep," upon "Smoke and Dust," and upon "Carelessness." It would be better perhaps, if the critics would not take these "trifles" so seriously; surely it is hardly fair to find in these feats of rhetorical skill "the true Fronto." "Puisque le fond ne compte pas," says Monceaux, "le talent s'affirmera d'autant mieux que la matière sera plus maigre. Aussi *le vrai Fronton* est-il dans les purs exercices de rhétorique...dans ces riens qu'il se donne tant de mal à embellir et qu'il ne réussit pas à rendre moins insipides[3]." It is true that Fronto's efforts to support his motion at any cost are as extravagant as some of the arguments which are to be heard at a modern debating society. For instance, in his defence of Sleep, he affirms that Marcus did his best work in the evening just before the time for slumber, because sleep wafts its charm before it, as the crocus its fragrance[4]. That the approach of sleep stimulates mental effort is not the common experience of mankind. But it is all good practice—and in Fronto's eyes, if not in those of his critics, it is all a jest. "Enough of this jesting," he ends, "it was for love of you rather than from personal conviction[5]." Or again, writing to Appian he says, "So much for this sport between friend and friend[6]."

[1] p. 211. Stevenson, in his Essay on Style, recommends exercises in writing not unlike these "nugalia."

[2] Cf. Lucian on "the Fly."

[3] Monceaux, *op. cit.* p. 235.

[4] p. 12.

[5] p. 228.

[6] p. 251.

It is in these rhetorical compositions that Fronto advises the insertion of mythological stories, proverbs, suitable verses and "fictions." "Stories of gods or heroes should be introduced," he says, "at suitable stages, also verses which are to the point, proverbs suited to the subject, and fictions neatly invented, provided the fiction be supported by some witty proof[1]"; advice which is echoed in part by Julius Victor, "proverbio uti non ignoto percommodum est, et versiculo aut parte versus[2]." Not only does Fronto approve of the insertion of verse-quotations into prose composition[3], but he recommends the writing of verse as a help to oratorical prose. We must, of course, remember that the barriers between prose and poetry were no longer so sharply defined as in the past; poetry was more prosaic and prose more poetical. So that it is not strange to find Marcus, as Emperor, admitting that he now "realises the advantage of polishing four or five lines a day[4]," or Fronto writing that "verse is generally of assistance in speechwriting, and oratory is still more a help to writing verse[5]." Above all it was from the poets of the early republic that Fronto sought to enrich his vocabulary by the addition of those "unexpected and unlooked for

[1] p. 212. Cf. Cic. *de Orat.* II. 59, "causam mendaciunculis adspergere." Cf. Quint. IV. 2. 88.

[2] Jul. Vict. *de Epist.* p. 448. 29, Halm.

[3] For Fronto's own practice cf. L. Ehrenthal, *Quaestiones Frontonianae*, ch. 2, pp. 31 ff. Ehrenthal maintains that a great many more verses from old poets are hidden in Fronto's prose than is apparent in Naber's text, and attributes to this abundance of quotation some of the archaisms, and especially the excessive use of alliteration, in Fronto's prose.

[4] p. 253. As a modern parallel we might cite Lord Cromer, who wrote Latin verses throughout his residence in Egypt.

[5] p. 54.

words which are only found by zeal and care and watching, and by a memory well-stocked with the old poets[1]." The approximation of poetry and prose to one another, the failure to apprehend the peculiar *genus* of each, is almost invariably assumed to be a sign of decay in a literature. Yet may it not be that in insisting upon the essential difference we have overlooked the essential likeness[2]? I give the following from T. Herbert Warren's recently published *Essays of poets and poetry*: "Prose differs from poetry in degree rather than in kind....The secrets (i.e. of prose) are as subtle and as many as those of verse...what is more important is that they are for the most part the same as those of verse:—*Order, rhythm, alliteration, assonance, the choice of words* and *the combination of words*, the grouping of phrases and sentences, of paragraphs and periods, these are among them. The skilful joining or introduction, *the 'callida iunctura' which makes an old word new*, or prevents a new one from jarring or startling, belongs as much to prose as to verse[3]." The italicised words might well stand as a summary of Fronto's theory of prose style; and in his use of the poets, as well as of Cato and Sallust, as models he was wholly consistent with his theory.

In this opinion Fronto differs widely from his predecessors in rhetoric; Cicero, while true in the main to Aristotle's[4] maxim that the diction of prose and the

[1] p. 63, "insperata atque inopinata verba, quae non nisi cum studio atque cura atque vigilia atque *multa veterum carminum memoria indagantur*."

[2] It is significant that in Germany, for example, it was the poets, Lessing and Goethe, who brought prose writing to perfection.

[3] T. H. Warren, *Essays of poets and poetry*, p. 129. For Fronto's use of alliteration and assonance, *vid. inf.* ch. XII.

[4] Arist. *Rhet.* III. 1. 9.

diction of poetry are distinct, admitted that poetical words occasionally lent dignity even to a speech[1]. But Quintilian deprecates their use most bitterly; the result, he declares, is a monstrosity, like Horace's human head on a horse's neck[2]. Yet his opposition did not apparently meet with great success, for in Tacitus' day it was said that "even of an orator there was required a poetical colouring, borrowed from the treasury of Horace or Vergil or Lucan[3]," and Tacitus himself admits many Vergilianisms into his prose.

[1] Cic. *de Orat.* III. 38. 153: "sed tamen raro habet etiam in oratione poeticum aliquod verbum dignitatem." Cf. *ib.* III. 44, 175; 47, 182 (accidental verses are to be avoided).

[2] Quint. VIII. 3. 60, cf. *ib.* VIII. 6. 17, IX. 4. 72 ("versum in oratione fieri multo foedissimum est totum, sed etiam in parte deforme"). Cf. also *ib.* X. 1. 27—30. He strongly disapproves of Asinius Pollio who often ("non raro") incorporated verse in his prose. Cf. *ib.* IX. 4. 76.

[3] Tac. *Dial.* 20.

CHAPTER XI.

FRONTO AS A LITERARY CRITIC.

"Nec unquam factum est quotiens eum (i.e. Frontonem) vidimus loquentemque audivimus, quin rediremus fere cultiores doctioresque." AULUS GELLIUS, XIX. 8. 1.

NOTHING is a better criterion of a man's theory of style than his literary criticism. Quintilian, the Ciceronian, "dismisses Ennius with a few respectful words," practically ignores Pacuvius and Accius, considers Plautus, Terence and Caecilius inferior to their Greek originals and totally misunderstands Lucretius. So it is in the case of Fronto, whose literary criticism is the natural outcome of his theory of eloquence and style and his worship of words. It resembles Quintilian's in that it is strictly practical; everything is referred to the standard of oratory and every author is examined from the rhetorical point of view. But whereas Quintilian took Cicero for his model, Fronto went further back, beyond Classicism to Archaism. The phrase which he himself applies to the verdict of History upon men's military achievements—"faveri praeteritis, invideri praesentibus[1]"—would apply equally well

[1] p. 204.

to his own literary judgments, for he looks always backwards, mentioning few authors later than Cicero and those few in terms of disparagement. Indeed the words which he uses of imperial oratory in the Silver Age express his feelings with regard to post-Augustan literature in general: "After Augustus something still remained for Tiberius, though already withered and fading; but the succeeding emperors, as far as Vespasian, were all men whose words inspire shame as their characters regret and their deeds pity[1]." "Turn back," is his cry, "turn back rather to words which are fitting and suitable and imbued with their own true sap; from books of this kind (he has been criticising Lucan's *Pharsalia*) come roughness and rust. 'Tis the famous old coinage after which I follow[2]."

"In literary criticism," says Nettleship, "his utterances do not go beyond neatly formulated criticisms of the old scholastic type[3]." The charge can be substantiated in the main as far as regards Fronto's characterisation of Roman orators and historians[4], his list of Greek philosophers[5], or his canon of Roman poets[6]. In these the leading characteristic of each author is summed up in a single epithet, or (in accordance with the critic's preoccupation with vocabulary) each man is noticed for the particular type of words in which he excels. "Among poets, as everyone knows, Lucilius is a type of the meagre,

[1] p. 123. The evidence of Tac. *Ann.* XIII. 3 would imply that Fronto's judgment of the oratory of Tiberius, Caligula and Claudius is unnecessarily harsh. "Tiberius artem quoque callebat, qua verba expenderet, tum validus sensibus aut consulto ambiguus. Etiam Gai Caesaris turbata mens vim dicendi non corrupit. Nec in Claudio, quotiens meditata dissereret, elegantiam requireres."

[2] p. 161. [3] H. Nettleship, *Lectures and Essays*, Vol. II. p. 91. pp. 113, 114. [5] pp. 114, 115. [6] p. 62, cf. p. 224.

Abuccius[1] of the dry style, Lucretius is lofty, Pacuvius neither high nor low, Accius unequal[2], Ennius varied. Again, in history Sallust has written in set periods, Pictor in loosely-strung clauses, Claudius with charm; Antias is ungraceful, Sisenna wearisome[3], Cato uses words in long teams, Caelius single words[4]. Again, in public harangues Cato is fierce, Gracchus noisy, Cicero full; while in judicial speeches Cato storms, Cicero exults, Gracchus is vehement and Calvus quarrelsome[5]"; or again, speaking of those

[1] The cod. reads *Albucius* which Teuffel refers to the Epicurean T. Albucius, whom Lucilius ridicules for his Graeco-mania. But since there is no evidence that this Albucius wrote poetry at all, Prof. Minton Warren (in *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 1894) emends to *Abuccius*. Cf. Varro, *R. R.* iii. 6. 6 and iii. 2. 17 ("item L. Abuccius, ut homo, scitis, adprime doctus, cuius Luciliano charactere sunt libelli").

[2] "inaequalis," sic cod. Klussmann emends to "aequalis," in order to have a contrast with "multiformis," the epithet applied to Ennius.

[3] We have in this list three pairs of names, Sallust and Pictor, Claudius and Antias, Cato and Caelius; but there is no name to balance that of Sisenna. Hence Klussman would obelise. He suggests that the name omitted may be Rutilius, a contemporary of Claudius Quadrigarius and Valerius Antias, mentioned in Vell. Pat. II. 9. 4. The adverb attached to Sisenna is "longinque," which Teuffel refers to the length of the work, but which Mai refers rather to the language (="inusitate," cf. Cic. *Brut.* 75. 260) as also does Prof. Warren, who compares p. 64, where "remotis et requisitis" is opposed to "vulgaribus et usitatis." Cf. also Quint. VIII. 6. 17 ("a longinqua similitudine ductae"). Cornelissen emends to "concinne."

[4] "verbis Cato multijugis, Coelius singulis." Prof. Warren (*loc. cit.*) suggests that these might be translated "with polysyndeton...with asyndeton" respectively. For polysyndeton in Cato cf. Prof. Robinson Ellis, *op. cit.* App. p. 23, cf. Cato ap. Gell. VII. 3. 4, "scio solere plerisque hominibus rebus secundis atque prolixis atque prosperis animum excellere, atque superbiam atque ferociam augescere, atque crescere." Cf. *ib.* XIII. 24. 14, and Fronto, p. 36, "nam uni M. Porcio me dedicari atque despondi atque delegari. Hoc etiam ipsum *atque* unde putas? ex ipso furore."

[5] pp. 113, 114.

authors who addressed themselves to the search for words, he especially commends Cato, Sallust, Plautus, Ennius and Coelius, mentions also Naevius, Lucretius, Accius, Caecilius and Laberius, and adds: "In addition to these you may find individual authors to be choice in particular branches; for example, Novius and Pomponius and their school in words of country life, or of jesting and banter, Atta in words used by women, Sisenna in love-scenes, Lucilius in words appropriate to each profession and business[1]." Yet when we turn to his censure of the affectations of Seneca and the tasteless repetitions of Lucan, we find something more than mere scholastic criticism. Seneca, the child of a new era, who boasted that he bore the name of no man, "nullius nomen fero," who dared to assert that oratory had no fixed rules[2], and who despised erudition as well as archaism[3], was naturally the *bête noire* of archaist and Ciceronian alike. "Sand without chalk," Caligula had called him[4] even in the height of his popularity. Later it was in him that Quintilian saw the most serious obstacle in the way of a return to the Golden Age, and realising how easily his peculiarities lent themselves to degradation, he opposed the use of Seneca as a model[5]. While Aulus Gellius, on the other hand, criticised Seneca from the standpoint of the pure archaist ("eruditio etiam vernacula et plebeia, nihilque ex veterum scriptis habens neque gratiae neque dignitatis[6]"), Fronto,

[1] p. 62.
[2] Cf. Sen. *Ep.* XIX. 5. 13: "oratio certam regulam non habet."
[3] Cf. *Ep.* 114.
[4] Cf. Suet. *Calig.* 53, "harena...sine calce."
[5] Cf. Quint. x. 1. 125 ff.
[6] Gell. XII. 2.

like Quintilian, looked with dread upon the imitation of his mannerisms, "facilis ad lubrica lapsus est[1]." He parodies his farfetched affected style, and, ironically proclaiming himself his follower ("Senecae Annaei sectator"), talks of "a cup without the informer's brand" (*sine delatoria nota*), meaning "without spot or prick"; for, he adds, "it is not meet that I, who am such[2] a learned man, should use the common name and call the cup 'acentetum[3].'"

In another letter he deprecates a "miscellaneous style of eloquence, like a tree on which different buds have been grafted,—here a shoot of the pine-nuts of Cato and here the soft plums of Seneca, which produce fever," and adds, "I am perfectly well aware that the fellow is full to overflowing of aphorisms, but I see that his sentences trot, but never speed on at full gallop, never force an issue, never aim at grandeur; to quote Laberius[4], he fashions witty sallies, or perhaps I should say witticisms, rather than maxims[5]." He compares him to the guest who tosses his olives in the air and catches them in his lips, as the conjuror catches his counters, thereby securing the applause of the boys[6]; and while admitting the presence

[1] p. 156.

[2] Reading "tam homo doctus." So Klussmann, for cod. "iam." For "tam" with an adjective cf. p. 85: "tam sanctus uxori, tam fratri bonus ac benignus."

[3] p. 224.

[4] Dr Hauler reads "ut Laberius ait, dictabolaria immo dicteria potius quam dicta confingere" for Naber's "ut Laberius, dictabolaria immo dicteria potius eum quam dicta continere." (Heindorf and Klussmann: "continuare").

[5] pp. 155, 156.

[6] Cf. Quint. x. 1. 130: "si rerum pondera minutissimis sententiis non fregisset, consensu potius eruditorum quam puerorum amore comprobaretur."

in his books of "clever, nay even weighty sayings," he adds, "Silver coins are sometimes found even in sewers; do we on that account buy sewers, to clear them out[1]?" The peculiar interest of all this lies in the fact that between critic and criticised there are many points of resemblance. Fronto has not the glib wordiness of Seneca, nor is he so full of those mottoes which make the reading of Seneca like the perusal of a birthday book or a calendar. Yet the peculiar mannerisms of the two are but different forms of the affectation which is their common characteristic[2]. Monceaux even goes so far as to say that it was Seneca the Stoic philosopher whom Fronto detested, and that, as an author, Fronto was of Seneca's school and imitated him[3]. It is a criticism which is just true enough to make its untruth dangerous. Fronto, the archaist, the rhetorician who worshipped words, could not consciously imitate the philosopher who scorned the beauties of style, distrusted rhetoric, and held up the archaistic movement to ridicule. Affectation has many varieties and many causes. Nor is Fronto the only man who has criticised in another the faults of which he himself stood convicted; Seneca, too, reproved those who followed him as their model for the very faults which they had learnt from himself[4].

[1] p. 157.

[2] Cf. p. 225: "qua malum volup" etc., for one of the worst specimens of affectation in Fronto. The same device of abbreviation is found in Ennius, *Ann.* 451 (Vahlen): "laetificum gau" (=gaudium).

[3] Monceaux, *op. cit.* p. 224: "ce qu'il détestait en Sénèque, c'était uniquement le philosophe: comme écrivain, il était de son école et l'imitait."

[4] Cf. C. Martha on "Sénèque," in *Mélanges de littérature ancienne*, p. 248. "Chose fort étrange et qui mérite d'être signalée! Ces défauts que nous relevons chez Sénèque, il les a vus lui-même, il les a décrits

The other object of Fronto's especial censure is Lucan —and in this case at least the criticism cannot be founded upon any but literary grounds. Lucan had already been attacked by Petronius[1] and Quintilian[2] for his want of true poetry; Fronto, applying his theory of the worth of words and the respect due to them, attacks him on another side. With an acuteness which in anyone else would have called forth admiration, he dissects the proem of the *Pharsalia* and shows up pitilessly its superfluous repetition and verbiage[3]. The number of phrases in which Lucan expresses the one idea "wars worse than civil" is contrasted by Fronto (who ironically suggests a few additions) with the brevity of Apollonius Rhodius in the proem to the *Argonautica*. The truth of the criticism is undeniable, and it is incidentally a striking testimony to the fact that Fronto did not, in spite of his love for language itself, approve the substitution of language for thought, as his critics commonly suppose.

Cato, Sallust[4], Caius Gracchus, Coelius Antipater, Cornelius Sisenna, Claudius Quadrigarius, Ennius, Plautus, Lucretius, Accius, Pacuvius, Caecilius, Laberius, Naevius, Pomponius, Atta, Sisenna, the speeches of Scipio, the "fabulae togatae," the "Atellanae[5]"—these are Fronto's

avec la plus délicate critique, il les a reconnus—chez les autres!...Par quelle bizarre méconnaissance de lui-même a-t-il pu, en faisant une vive sortie contre le style de ses contemporains, se montrer si sévère pour ceux auxquels il servait d'exemplaire et de modèle?" Cf. *ib.* p. 249: "Le premier effet de la corruption littéraire est de ne pas se connaître elle-même."

[1] Petronius, *Cena Trimalchionis*, 118.

[2] Quint. x. 1. 90. [3] pp. 157, 158.

[4] It is Sallust as a speech-writer rather than Sallust as a historian whom Fronto admires. Cf. pp. 48, 49, etc

[5] pp. 62, 113, 114, 149, etc.

favourites, the books which he recommends to his pupils. Cato especially is his idol—"greatest of orators and generals[1]," "pre-eminent in praise of speech and action[2]." To Sallust, "sectator Catonis[3]," he gives the affectionate title of "noster," and the highest praise which he can bestow upon a well-turned "sententia" which Marcus sends him is to say that it might be put into one of Sallust's books, "without any difference or inferiority being noticeable[4]." Marcus, we may observe, did not share this taste for Sallust[5], though Gracchus and Cato delighted him[6].

From Plautus Fronto quotes continually[7], and his own vocabulary is full of Plautine reminiscences. In a hurried business letter he stops to draw a Plautine illustration[8], and in the letter on "Holidays" ("de feriis Alsiensibus") he pictures Marcus "taking a polish from Plautus, sating himself with Accius, calming his mind with Lucretius, or firing it with Ennius[9]." Fronto's picture of an ideal

[1] p. 129.

[2] p. 203. Schwierczina (*op. cit.* p. 12) censures Fronto for not quoting more largely from Cato, Ennius, etc.: "haud dubie a summo eloquentiae Catonianae admiratore te plus de Catone comperturum esse exspectaveris." Surely it was unnecessary for Fronto to write out in his letters large extracts from authors, copies of whose works Marcus presumably possessed, or borrowed from his tutor. (Cf. pp. 104, 105: "mitte mihi aliquid quod tibi disertissimum habeatur, quod legam, vel tuum aut Catonis aut Ciceronis aut Sallustii aut Gracchi aut poetae alicujus." Cf. p. 107: "Ciceronis epistulas, si forte electas, totas vel dimidiatas habes, inpertias, vel mone quas potissimum legendas mihi censeas ad facultatem sermonis ferendam," etc.)

[3] p. 62. [4] p. 48. [5] p. 36. [6] pp. 56, 68, 69.

[7] Cf. pp. 27, 64, 178 (from the *Miles Gloriosus*), p. 33 (from the *Kolax*), etc.

[8] p. 178.

[9] p. 224. Cf. Gell. XIX. 8. 6, where Fronto calls Plautus the glory of the Latin tongue—"linguae Latinae decus."

holiday seems to have struck nearly all the critics as peculiarly ridiculous. Even Professor Ellis finds it difficult to read it without a smile. But it is only fair to observe that reading is only one item among several on Fronto's programme, which includes "a walk to the seashore, a row in a boat, to enjoy the sound of the oars in the still air," a bath, a most superior dinner, and a good sleep. After all there are still some people in the world who never dream of going on a holiday without a few favourite books. Are they all to be condemned as pedants?

So far, then, Fronto's tastes are entirely antiquarian; for he was an archaist by conviction and for practical purposes, and he saw in these old authors the best literary training towards the realisation of his aim. But there is another author whom Fronto has included in his list and whom he praises in no measured terms. Cicero has had many compliments paid to him, in spite of Theodor Mommsen, but never, perhaps, has he received a greater tribute than in the praises of the man who spent his life fighting Ciceronianism. Fronto is no blind admirer; he dares to censure in Cicero the want of those "unexpected and unlooked-for words" with whose importance as a feature of style we have already dealt, and which only a study of the ancient authors can supply. "He seems to me," he writes of Cicero, "to have held too far aloof from the minute search for language, either from the loftiness of his spirit, or because he shirked the labour, or because he was confident that the words which others barely acquired by search would come to his hand unsought[1]."

[1] p. 62. Cf. L. Laurand, *Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron*, Paris, 1907, p. 113: "Le choix des mots préoccupe moins Cicéron que leurs diverses combinaisons." Cf. *Orat.* 49. 163, "verba...

"Vel magnitudine animi"—the words admit frankly the genius of the great orator, "the famous head and fount of Roman eloquence," all whose writings Fronto had read again and again with the utmost care[1], whose superlative handling of all other classes of words he asserts so firmly. "I consider him," he says, "to have used invariably the finest words, and to have surpassed all other orators in the splendour with which he adorned everything which he wished to set off with distinction[2]." Nevertheless (to quote two typical comments upon this passage) Norden calls the criticism "monstrous[3]" and Müller doubts the sanity of the critic[4]. Fronto has paid a heavy price for his daring, and, one might add, for his consistency, since his criticism of Ciceronian purism is (with all deference to Müller) the sane and inevitable conclusion of his whole theory; and from another point of view, it seems hard that a man who is continually censured for want of originality should simultaneously be attacked for having had the temerity to express an original[5] view. For the sake of such shreds of Fronto's reputation as may yet

legenda sunt potissimum bene sonantia, sed ea non ut poetae exquisita ad sonum sed sumpta de medio." Cf. *ib.* 49. 164, and 24. 80.

[1] p. 63: "ut qui eius scripta omnia studiosissime lectitarim."

[2] p. 63.

[3] E. Norden, *op. cit.* p. 364.

[4] E. Müller, *Marc-Aurel in seinen Briefen an Fronto*, 1869, p. 11: "Fast möchte man an den gesunden Verstande des hochmüthigen Fronto zweifeln."

[5] The only man who seems to have criticised Cicero previously along similar lines is Largius Licinus, who in his *Ciceromastix* attacked the great orator for lack of precision and inaccurate use of words. Cf. Gell. XVII. 1. 1, "Gallus Asinius et Largius Licinus, cuius liber etiam fertur infando titulo 'Ciceromastix,' ut scribere ausi sint M. Ciceronem parum integre atque improprie atque inconsiderate locutum." Gellius, of course, calls Cicero "verborum homo diligentissimus" (XIII. 25).

remain, it seems worth while to cite a few more of those passages which illustrate his appreciation of Cicero's genius.

Again and again Fronto pays Cicero the highest tribute in his power by coupling his name with those of Cato, Sallust, Gracchus and others of his beloved ancients[1]. He describes him, as we have seen, as "full," or "copious," in public harangues, "exultant" in forensic oratory[2]; in short "the greatest and supreme mouthpiece of the Roman language[3]." It is from Cicero's *Pro Caelio* that he illustrates the use of figures[4], and of the *Pro Lege Manilia* he writes, "I assure you that in my judgment no one was ever more eloquently praised in the assembly of the people, either in the Greek or the Latin tongue, than was Cn. Pompey in that speech; so that it seems to me that his surname 'Great' rested not so much on his own virtues as on Cicero's eulogies[5]"—a tribute to Cicero no less than to the power of eloquence.

Cicero's Letters he thought perfect, and ranked them higher than the Speeches. "I think that the Letters of Cicero ought *all* to be read—even rather, in my opinion, than all his speeches. There is nothing more perfect than the Letters of Cicero[6]." The rich vocabulary of the Letters, a vocabulary which draws largely upon the comic poets, would naturally attract Fronto. It is remarkable that this high opinion of the Letters, comparatively isolated until recent times[7], has been confirmed by Ciceronian

[1] pp. 105, 125, 145, 149, 224, etc. [2] p. 114.
[3] p. 125. [4] p. 108. [5] pp. 221, 222. [6] p. 107.
[7] It seems to have been shared by Marcus Aurelius—as was only natural; cf. p. 52, "epistula Ciceronis mirifice adfecit animum meum," and p. 107. Cf. also Jul. Vict. *de sermocinatione*, *ap.* Halm, *Rhet. Lat. min.* 448, 29, "multum ad sermonis elegantiam conferent comoediae

critics of to-day. "It is impossible," says Herbert Paul[1], "to over-estimate his Letters....The essence of Latinity is to be found not so much in the lyric or the epic poet as in the comedies of Plautus, and the Letters of Cicero." It was precisely this "essence of Latinity" which Fronto was seeking[2], and he found it, as we are just beginning to find it, in those letters which Tyrrell and Purser call "the highwater mark of Latin prose." Yet it is of this critic that a recent editor of the *Meditations* writes: "He really admires what he praises, and his way of saying so is not unlike what passes for criticism at the present day[3]."

It is true that the epithet "Tullianus" has a slight touch of contempt[4]. "Man fühlt...dass Cicero nicht sein Mann ist," says Schanz; which is true, in the sense that Cicero as an orator and stylist did not embody his ideal. The very adjective "remissioribus[5]" which is coupled with "Tullianis" in one passage, reminds us that, as we saw, Fronto missed in Cicero that painstaking search for

veteres et togatae et tabernariae et Atellanae fabulae et mimofabulae, multum etiam epistolae veteres, inprimis Tullianae." For the importance of the comic poets, cf. Fronto, p. 106, "sententias arriperetis...vel comes ex comedis vel urbanes ex togatis vel ex Atellanis lepidas et facetas," and for the resemblance between the vocabulary of the Letters and that of the comic poets see Tyrrell and Purser, *Correspondence of Cicero*, Vol. I.

[1] Herbert Paul, *Men and Letters*, p. 246 (on "The Father of Letters").

[2] Cf. p. 28. Marcus Aurelius' comment on Fronto's speech, "nihil latinius legi"; cf. p. 101, "nam de elegantia quid dicam? nisi te latine loqui, nos ceteros neque graece neque latine."

[3] W. H. D. Rouse, in the appendix to his edition of Meric Casaubon's translation of the *Meditations*, London, 1900. Dr Rouse speaks also of Fronto's "fatuous criticisms of style."

[4] pp. 23, 25, 76, 98. [5] p. 23.

words, that perfection in detail, which in the greater man were always subservient to breadth and grasp and general inspiration. Yet with many of Cicero's views on style Fronto must have agreed, just as he must have sympathised with Cicero's opposition to the modern school of his day, *οἱ νεωτερίζοντες*. That he realised the immeasurable superiority of the great orator is, I think, indisputable, unless one is to doubt Fronto's sincerity—the one virtue which he is generally admitted to have possessed. Referring to a passage in his speech for the Bithynians, he says, "I think it will please you if you read the noble words of M. Tullius on the same subject (i.e. the past life of the defendants), still extant in his defence of L. Sulla: not that you may compare like with like, but so that you may see how far short my commonplace talents fall of his wonderful eloquence[1]."

Of other writers of the Golden Age Fronto once mentions Horace (whose "Gardens of Maecenas" he himself occupied) as a "notable" poet[2]. He could hardly be expected to have much in common with the champion of the new Augustan school. There is no reference to Terence, nor to Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid or Vergil—the last a remarkable omission in view of Aulus Gellius' admiration for the epic poet[3]. It is partially accounted for, perhaps, by Fronto's preoccupation with

[1] pp. 182, 183.

[2] p. 23. For tacit reminiscences of Horace in Fronto, cf. M. Hertz, *Renaissance und Rococo*, p. 47, note 76, and Schwierczina, *Frontoniana*, p. 31.

[3] For reminiscences of Vergil in Fronto, cf. Schwierczina, *op. cit.* p. 31. Aulus Gellius does not mention Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid, Livy, Juvenal, Quintilian, Tacitus, the younger Pliny, Martial or Statius, and only once refers to Horace (II. 22. 25).

rhetoric; for he hardly deals with poets save from the point of view of vocabulary, and here Plautus and the older poets would give him far more material than the Augustans. The Flavian period he left entirely untouched; he could hardly be in sympathy with its literary production and was perhaps too wise, as Professor Ellis suggests, to attack the great names of an epoch so near his own.

CHAPTER XII.

FRONTO'S VOCABULARY AND STYLE.

As regards the more technical aspects of Fronto's own style, it is not my purpose to go over again the ground which has been covered by Ebert[1], Schwierczina[2] and Priebe[3], the first of whom has dealt with Fronto's syntax and the last two mainly with his borrowings from the vocabulary of older writers. Schwierczina has shown that this borrowing is not confined to the older authors (although Fronto's debt is in the main Plautine[4]), but that he is also under obligations to Cicero, Horace, Vergil, Livy and Tacitus[5]. He also gives a list of words, found for the first time in Fronto[6], which are probably either colloquialisms taken from the spoken language or archaisms which do not happen to occur in such old Latin

[1] Cf. A. Ebert, "de quibus Frontonianae," in *Acta Soc. Phil. Lipsiensis*, II. 1881, pp. 311–357.

[2] Cf. B. Schwierczina, *Frontonis Reliquiae*, Berlin, 1887.

[3] Cf. Z. Priebe, "de Frontone prisci sermonis Latini scriptore imitatissimo," *Gym. progr. Stett.* 18.

[4] Cf. Schwierczina, op. cit. p. 21. Fronto's language resembles that of Plautus even more than that of Ennius.

[5] Cf. *ib.* pp. 21, 27, for a list of words in Fronto which do not occur except in silver Latin authors.

[6] *Ib.* pp. 27, 28. Cf. Kornemann, *Leben des Fronto*, p. 75.

authors as have come down to us; and he enumerates the diminutives which Fronto uses so freely, and which were a feature of archaic and of spoken Latin. Reminiscences of the language of the jurisconsults, natural enough in one who was himself the leading lawyer of his day, are not infrequent[1]. With the so-called Africanisms of his language and style I shall deal in the chapter on that subject; it will be seen that they are neither numerous nor striking[2], for to Fronto, a Roman by training, albeit an African by birth, might be applied the words which Statius addressed to the African Septimius Severus:

> "non sermo Poenus, non habitus tibi,
> externa non mens; Italus, Italus[3]."

Nevertheless some general account of Fronto's style is demanded, for it has received even less sympathetic treatment than his theory. Over and above the archaism and colloquialism and the careful choice and arrangement of words, which are simply the practical applications of his theory, its most striking features are the occasional ringing out of that romantic, medieval note, which is heard so clearly in Apuleius, and the reappearance upon the surface of certain qualities, latent in the Latin tongue, but suppressed during the reign of Classicism.

The prose of Apuleius, with "its perpetual refinement of diction and its short broken rhythms," seems to have

[1] *ib.* App. II.

[2] *ib.* p. 38. They occur not only in the letters on judicial cases (cf. pp. 13, 37, 192, etc.), but also in those on general matters, cf. p. 224 (*delatorius*), p. 227 (*demonstratio*), p. 227 (*parum cavisse*), p. 89 (*in solutum dependere*).

[3] Stat. *Silv.* IV. 5. 45.

little in common with the stately flow and structural balance of Cicero's Latin. That is why all the critics of all nations, with a unanimity rare in the history of literary criticism, apply to him the mildly opprobrious epithet "bizarre." It is at least a relief to have one Latin author successfully labelled. But few of these same critics have perceived that it is in Fronto that we first catch, here and there, in rhythm and cadence and turn of sentence, the new, romantic note which is the essence of Apuleius' "bizarre" style. It is only, I think, in Mackail's *Latin Literature*[1] that Fronto (like every author with whom that book deals) receives a sympathetic appreciation. Mackail quotes, as an instance of this new cadence, the sentence "novissimum namque homini sapientiam colenti amiculum est gloriae cupido: id novissime exuitur[2]." "The turn of phrase here," he remarks, "is completely different from the way in which Cicero or Quintilian would express the same idea." Rhythm is difficult to analyse, and the scientific analysis of it which has found such favour in recent years is apt to be unsatisfactory. Fronto's latest Italian critic, Beltrami, has compared the phalecians in Fronto with those of Catullus, Statius and Martial[3]; but after all we are not much further. He has given us also a detailed comparison of the "epideictic" excerpts from Fronto (i.e. the *Fable of Sleep* and the

[1] Cf. *ib.* pp. 233 ff. I should like to record my indebtedness to this book, for it was the chapter on the "Elocutio Novella" which first introduced me to Fronto and the African school.

[2] p. 144. Cf. Tac. *Hist.* IV. 6, "etiam sapientibus cupido gloriae novissime exuitur." Cf. also Epict. 33, Plut. *an Seni Resp. ger.* p. 7830 (the reply of Simonides), and Athen. XI. 507 D. Cf. Milton, "Fame, that last infirmity of noble minds."

[3] Cf. A. Beltrami, *op. cit.* App. 1, pp. 72 ff.

Arion) with the beginning of Seneca's *de Clementia*, and arrives at the conclusion that Fronto uses the Ciceronian rhythm neither more nor less than Seneca[1]. All this cutting up of sentences into so many long and short syllables savours too much of the dissecting-room, and the life of the language is apt to escape in the process. Perhaps a better plan would be to turn from the critics to Fronto himself, and to read, just as he wrote it, the *Fable of Sleep*[2]. It is like a new language, from the opening clause—"agere de finibus duos claros et nobiles Vesperum et Luciferum puta"—to the closing paragraph describing the gift of "a multitude of blissful dreams"—"ut quo studio quisque devinctus esset, ut histrionem in somnis fautor spectaret, ut tibicinem audiret, ut aurigae agitanti monstraret, milites somnio vincirent, imperatores somnio triumpharent, peregrinantes somnio domum redirent. Ea somnia plerumque ad verum convertunt." "Yes, and sometimes the dreams come true."

In all this the language, according to Fronto's own theory, exactly fits the imaginative beauty of the thought. One wonders if some of Fronto's critics have ever read the description of Jupiter expressing from the herb of death "a single drop only, no bigger than a tear one might hide[3]."

"Alike in the naïve and almost childlike simplicity of its general structure and in its minute and intricate ornament, like that of a diapered wall or a figured

[1] *ib.* p. 42 ff.

[2] pp. 227—230. *Vid. inf.* for text and translation. An exquisite translation is given by Walter Pater, in *Marius the Epicurean*.

[3] Yet Dr Rouse (*op. cit.*) writes: "It would be hard to conceive of anything more vapid than the style and conception of these letters; clearly the man was a pedant without imagination or taste."

tapestry, where hardly an inch of space is ever left blank, this new style," says Mackail, "is much more akin to the manner of the thirteenth or fourteenth century than to the Classical." And all this is deliberate, for Fronto paid keen attention to rhythm. He it is who censures the "verba modulate collocata et effeminate fluentia" of Seneca[1], maintaining that "one ought to use the shield of Achilles, not wave a toy shield and play with the sham spears of the stage." On another occasion he calls the attention of Marcus Aurelius to a "sententia" which he has written in the manner of Cicero: "ut non ocius aut vehementius terra urbem illam quam animos audientium tua oratio moverit[2]." He himself is more "Ciceronian" in rhythm in some letters than in others; but the general impression with which one is left after reading a number of the letters is that the structure which had taken centuries to mould is being deliberately broken up by asyndeton[3] and anacoluthon and by those short, broken sentences, which are such a characteristic of the Latin of Apuleius. In the *Arion*[4] this is especially noticeable, in such a sentence as "Carminis fine cum verbo in mare desilit; delphinus excipit, sublimem avehit, navi praevortit, Taenaro exponit, quantum delphino fas erat, in extimo litore," or above, "Nave in altum provecta cognovit socios, qui veherent, cupidos potiri, necem sibi machinari[5]." Cicero, too, could never have ended a sentence with the

[1] p. 158. [2] p. 98.

[3] Cf. Ebert, *op. cit.* p. 41. Cf. p. 9. 10, p. 30. 2, p. 46. 14, p. 48. 4, p. 55. 3, p. 66. 24, p. 94. 17 and 21, p. 88. 13, p. 139. 10. There is also a considerable amount of polysyndeton in Fronto, which Ebert does not notice. *Vid. sup.* on the use of *atque* and cf. Ellis, *op. cit.* App. p. 23.

[4] p. 237. [5] p. 42.

words "quemquam amicum tibi[1]." And Fronto went still further, for not only was the Ciceronian rhythm broken up and done away with, but the ornaments of style which Ciceronian prose had spurned were revived. Most striking of all is the reappearance of alliteration and assonance[2]. These, the natural elements of poetry in a rude age[3], die out in most literatures as the command over quantity and metrical form grows, so that in Greek, for instance, Homer is already far beyond the alliterative stage; although, of course, alliteration and assonance occur here and there throughout Greek literature, as, for instance, in the ὁμοιοτέλευτον of Isocrates, or, in tragedy, to produce some special effect. In Latin, however, they play a far more important part. There would seem, indeed, to have been something about them peculiarly attractive to the Italian ear, and the Latin language, with all its similar case-endings and verbal terminations, lends itself naturally to assonance. Alliteration is widely used by Naevius, Ennius, Plautus and the tragedians, as we might expect at that early stage[4]. Plautus often uses it to secure a comic[5] effect, and the tragedians and Ennius

[1] Similar short sentences characterise the style of Augustine's *Sermones*. Cf. A. Regnier, *De la latinité des sermons de S. Augustin*, Paris, 1886, p. 149, "Ce style haché, sans périodes, composé de petites phrases qui se succèdent."

[2] Cf. App. on *Africitas*.

[3] Thus in early Anglo-Saxon literature they serve to distinguish poetry from prose.

[4] Cf. Plaut. *Capt.* 903.

[5] Alliteration is found also in the Tables of the Law. It is a very old Indo-Germanic device for emphasizing and quickening language. Cf. O. Weise, *Language and Character of the Roman People* (translated by H. A. Strong and A. Y. Campbell, London, 1909), p. 69, "It lent energy and strength to the language, forcing the thews and sinews of its structure to stand out in bold relief, especially in the arrangement of its consonants."

to express strong emotion; Lucretius often employs it, there are some traces of it in Catullus, and later writers, though they use it more sparingly, by no means despise it. In Vergil we find such phrases as "fit via vi," "casus Cassandra canebat," and in prose[1] it is found in Sallust, rarely in Livy, and often in Tacitus' speeches. Nor did Cicero and Caesar scorn to employ alliteration and assonance on occasion. In Cicero's famous line "o fortunatam natam me consule Romam" the ease with which "natam" and "Romam" could have been transposed proves that Cicero liked the jingle, whatever Quintilian and Juvenal thought about it; for Cicero's ear was far too sensitive to allow him to slip into the collocation inadvertently[1]; and after all it was Caesar the purist who sent the despatch "veni, vidi, vici."

We have already spoken, in connection with archaism, of the opposition which the Augustan movement had to encounter, and the key to it lies simply in the fact that the Augustan poetry, with all its perfection, was not the most Italian. Its language was artificial; nobody spoke it, and it had no root, since it did not rest upon the characteristics of any large portion of the population.

It was Plautus and Ennius, with all their alliteration and assonance, their emphasis and word-play, whom the Italians really loved. Classicism had suppressed these native tastes, at least among the educated, but they were not destroyed; with the decay of Classicism, the triumph of archaism and the admission of the popular element into literature, these stylistic devices, at once archaic and popular and peculiarly Italian, reappeared upon the

[1] Cf. also "pleniore ore" in *de Off.* I. 61, and "res mihi invisae visae sunt," quoted by Quint. IX. 4. 41, from a letter of Cicero to Brutus.

surface. There is hardly a page of Fronto where they do not occur in one form or another. "Vim verbi ac vetustatem[1]," "te tutum intus in tranquilla sinu suo tutatur[2]," "rancidos racemos et acidos acinos[3]," "fortia facinora fecimus[4]," "deos quaeso sit salvus sator, salva sint sata, salva seges sit, quae tam similes procreat[5]," "neque mensum neque pensum[6]," "intentum et infestum et instructum[7]," "magnum et maturum malum[8],"—these are but a few instances out of many, and the same devices, in the form of *ἰσόκωλα, ὁμοιοτέλευτα*, etc., are employed in the Greek Letters[9].

In connection with this reappearance upon the surface at this epoch of certain qualities latent in the Latin language, we may note briefly the revival of the old accentual treatment of Latin poetry. In the only Latin poem which can with any certainty be ascribed to this epoch, the *Pervigilium Veneris*[10], the quantitative structure of the metre is strictly observed, yet at the same time the accent and the metrical ictus tend to coincide instead of clashing, and in one-third of the poem do actually so coincide. The poem is, in fact, in the transition stage between quantity and accent, written, it would seem, by

[1] p. 64. [2] pp. 45, 46. [3] p. 67. [4] p. 68.

[5] p. 101. L. Ehrenthal, *op. cit.* p. 42, thinks that this is a quotation from one of the old Latin poets; it can be reduced to metrical form by very slight alterations.

[6] p. 205. [7] p. 233. [8] p. 219.

[9] Cf. p. 240: *παρωσθέντα...σφαλέντα...βληθέντα*. Cf. p. 250 (1, 12, 13, 15) and p. 125 (3, 6).

[10] The authorship of this poem is unknown. For text cf. Bücheler's edition. It is ascribed by Monceaux, *op. cit.* p. 381, to Nemesianus, by Bährens (*Poet. Lat. Min.* III. p. 263) to a 4th century Tiberianus, by Ribbeck (*Gesch. d. röm. Dicht.* III. p. 321) to Florus. But the evidence which they bring forward is not at all conclusive.

a man trained to write by quantity, but with a natural instinct to write by accent. If, as would appear to be the case, the old Saturnian metre was accentual[1], we have here another old native Italian feature reasserting itself. The poem is also noteworthy for the repetition at regular intervals of the words with which it begins ("cras amet qui nunquam amavit, quique amavit cras amet") as a refrain.

The extraordinary beauty of this short poem and of the "Golden Book of Apuleius" affords the best defence which could be desired of Fronto's theory of the preciousness of words; for it is just the wonderful sense of words and of their effect which makes the Latin of the *Pervigilium Veneris* and of Apuleius[2] something quite unique, so that Boissier said of the latter that it was a concert that he gave the people of Carthage each time he was heard, while to Adlington, his translator, it seemed that he had the Muses at his will "to feede and maintain his pen."

[1] I am aware that this statement has been challenged, and the evidence is, of course, not conclusive. But I cannot believe that the Saturnian was anything but an accentual metre, and there seems evidence for the living on of accentual poetry among the people (e.g. in the songs of the soldiers) right on through the Classical period. Cf. F. W. H. Myers, *Essays Classical*, pp. 134, 135.

[2] For a vigorous description of the sources of Apuleius' rich vocabulary see Chas. Whibley's introduction to Adlington's translation, p. x: "Greece, his own Carthage, the gutters of Rome, contribute to the wealth of his diction, for he knew nought of that pedantry which would cramp expression for authority's sake. The literary use of slang was almost his own invention. He would twist vulgar words of every day into quaint, unheard-of meanings, nor did he ever deny shelter to those loafers and footpads of speech which inspire the grammarians with horror....One quality only was distasteful to him,—the commonplace." Cf. also Pater's description of the Golden Book of Apuleius, in *Marius the Epicurean*.

The line of demarcation between originality and mannerism is very fine, and the determination to attain beauty in writing often lapses into the defects of its qualities; indeed Tyrrell has said of our own day that "to have a style is to be consistently and invariably affected." Once granted that writing is not merely an instinct but an art, one must expect artificiality to some extent in all save those few, who, soaring above the means, have attained the end. "Ars est celare artem," says Walter Pater, "is a saying which, exaggerated by inexact quotation, has perhaps been oftenest and most confidently quoted by those who have had little literary or other art to conceal." That Fronto is openly and flagrantly artificial[1] is beyond dispute, but it has been asserted with unnecessary adjectival emphasis by those who have overlooked the fact that it is difficult to be anything else but artificial when one is practically an "artificer" fashioning a new language, and that there are worse things in the world than artificiality,—such, for instance, as the "unaffected simplicity" of Suetonius[2], who has frankly no style at all, or the particularly unpleasing prose of Vitruvius, who is not even lucid. In the main Fronto observes his own rule, that clearness must take precedence

[1] We have already observed that some of the artificiality and affectation is to be ascribed to the relation of master and pupil in which the correspondents stand.

[2] Alcide Macé (in his *Essai sur Suétone*, Paris, 1900) speaks of Suetonius' "elegant and classic simplicity" (p. 399), and says, "le choix d'un style simple, clair et franc, est méritoire, surtout à une époque de décadence prétentieuse." Suetonius' style may be simple, but it is exceedingly dull reading. We may note that Macé shows conclusively (*ib.* pp. 226 ff.) that the "Tranquillus noster" to whom Fronto refers (pp. 118, 119) is not Suetonius.

even of style[1], and, save where the text is illegible, there are few passages of which the meaning is obscure. He has many limitations: in straightforward narrative, for example, of the type which he attempts in the story of the Ring of Polycrates[2], he is languid and dull. But it is never easy to re-tell Herodotus. Perhaps the truth of it all is that Fronto is too Ciceronian or not Ciceronian enough. It is only rarely that he dares to let himself go, to shatter the moulds in which language had crystallized so long. He is but feeling his way, leaving it for Apuleius, his fellow-countryman and successor, to show whither the way of "the fable of Sleep" was to lead. Fronto did not kill Latin, for Latin was not dead, and centuries after, Jerome[3], with all the freedom of his syntax and the richness of his vocabulary, was still writing a language remarkable for its classicality and for its preservation of the characteristics of the old Roman diction.

[1] p. 64. [2] pp. 219, 220.

[3] Cf. H. Gölzer, *La Latinité de St Jérôme*, Paris, 1884, pp. 32 ff. Cf. *ib.* pp. 41, 42: "On ne peut s'empêcher, en songeant à l'éclat jeté par Saint Jérôme sur la fin de la littérature latine, de ressentir une douloureuse émotion. Il y avait là plus qu'une promesse, un gage assuré de renaissance et de progrès. Ce que le Christianisme avait fait pour les mœurs, il était en train de le faire pour les lettres; il les restaurait.... Tout fut arrêté, sinon renversé, par la destruction de l'antique empire romain." St Augustine, also, still distinguishes between vulgar speech and "Latin": cf. *Enarr. in Psalm.* 138. 20, "quod vulgo dicitur ossum, latine os dicitur."

CHAPTER XIII.

FRONTO'S CHARACTER.

"Scholasticus tantum est, quo genere hominum nihil aut sincerius aut simplicius aut melius." PLINY, *Ep.* II. 3.

NOT merely Fronto the orator and the stylist but Fronto the man is reflected in these letters, and for all his sins he is an attractive personality; for, in spite of the affectations of his style, there is nothing that comes out more plainly in these letters than the naturalness of the writer. Cruttwell did him a better service than he intended when he wrote: "The letters give an excellent idea of his mind. They are well-stocked with words, and supply as little as possible of solid information[1]." It is not everyone who appreciates "solid information" in a letter from a friend, and while posterity is rightly grateful to Pliny for his information about the topography and customs of Rome, it is open to doubt whether the recipients of Pliny's letters shared our gratitude. Although Fronto, as we have seen, throws considerable light incidentally upon historical events and characters, it is family matters, the children, the weather, his health and eloquence, the thing which lay nearest his heart, which form the subjects

[1] Cruttwell, *History of Roman Literature*, p. 464.

on which he writes. Nowhere is the naturalness of these letters more charming than in the references to Marcus' children. He is afraid, he writes, that if little Faustina hears that he loves her father better than herself, she will refuse to give him her hands and feet to kiss. "And by the good gods," he adds, "I would rather kiss those fat little hands and feet than your princely neck and your good and gentle face[1]." In another letter he sends kisses to the babies[2], and in another describes a visit to the Emperor's "chicks" (Commodus and his twin brother Antoninus), in whose childish cries he seems to detect a likeness to their father's speech. "I have seen your chicks," he writes, "and it was the most delightful sight I have ever seen in my life; they are so like you that you can imagine no more perfect likeness....By the grace of heaven they have quite a healthy colour and strong lungs. One held a piece of white bread like a little prince, and the other a piece of common bread like a true philosopher's son....Even the little words I heard from them were so sweet and pretty that somehow I caught, in the crowing of the two babies, the charming, limpid sound of your speech[3]."

Of his own baby grandson Fronto was inordinately proud: "There is no word that Baby Fronto prattled earlier or repeats more often than 'da' (give). I for my part hand him what I have—little bits of paper or tablets, for I want to train his tastes in that direction. But besides this he has shown some signs of his grandfather's

[1] p. 75.

[2] p. 89: "Matronas nostras meo nomine exosculare."

[3] p. 101. For references to baby-language, cf. Min. Fel. *Oct.* 2: "liberis...adhuc dimidiata verba temptantibus." Cf. Hier. *Ep.* cvii.

genius. He loves grapes; they were the first food he really swallowed, and practically all day long he has never stopped sucking a grape, or kissing one, or chafing one on his gums or playing with them. Also he adores little birds, and is fascinated by young chickens, doves and sparrows—a passion which I have often heard from my tutors and masters possessed me from earliest babyhood. Everyone who is slightly acquainted with me knows how possessed I am in old age by a mania for partridges[1]." Even Fronto is not utterly devoid of humour[2].

Still more remarkable is the purity of thought and language. Opinions differ as to the morality of the Antonine Age, but it seems certain that there was much in the life of the capital, at least, which was far from pure. Yet in these confidential letters there is not a word (with the exception, perhaps, of the Ἐρωτικός which its very subject might conceivably condemn) which the most rigorous censor would excise. It may well have been this purity which endeared Fronto to his pure-minded pupil.

Keenness, that saving grace of the teacher, is another of the traits which we have noticed[3], and other leading

[1] p. 182. Cf. p. 87: "Aridelus iste...a pueritia me curavit a studio perdicum usque ad seria officia."

[2] H. Peter, *op. cit.*, is characteristically surprised at the naturalness of this letter: "In der Schilderung des Enkels scheint sogar wirklich natürliche Empfindung durchzubrechen." Cf. Teuffel: "In the amiable letter concerning his grandson, the tenderhearted grandfather shows even a tinge of humour."

[3] Cf. p. 48: "Ego beatus, hilaris, sanus, juvenis denique fio, quom tu ita proficis"; and cf. p. 55, etc., *Ad Am.* 1. 25, p. 188, in which Fronto describes his anxiety on behalf of a pupil, the son of Squilla Gallicanus, who was making a public speech.

characteristics of the man are a great capacity for love, a practical turn of mind, and absolute truthfulness. These last deserve, perhaps, rather fuller treatment than they have already received. Fronto's truthfulness has been disputed, as far as I know, by only one critic; for as a rule we find those who have pulled to pieces his literary reputation joining with equal unanimity to condone his literary failings by balancing against them his virtues as a husband and father[1]. It is the old expedient adopted by the champions of King Charles the First, and it has never been a great success. Monceaux, however, even goes so far as to doubt Fronto's veracity, on the evidence of an allusion which Marcus Aurelius makes to Fronto's complimentary references to himself in the *Laudatio* pronounced upon Antoninus Pius. "You will be careful in future," writes Marcus, "not to tell so many lies about me, especially in the Senate[2]." Monceaux, seizing with joy upon the chaffing *mentiri* as a confirmation of his darkest suspicions, concludes: "Au barreau pas plus qu'au Sénat Fronton ne se soucie de la vérité: c'est affaire de philosophe ou de savant....Il était convaincu que dans un discours la vérité n'avait que faire[3]." It may well be that Fronto exceeded the mark in his compliments; the public speech upon a reigning sovereign and his heir, containing the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, has yet to be written. At any rate Marcus seems to have been not wholly displeased with this "tissue of lies"—"A monstrous fine speech this!" he adds; "oh, if I could kiss your head at every heading of it." It was after all

[1] Cf. W. H. D. Rouse, *op. cit.*: "A sincere heart is better than literary taste." But not as constituting a qualification for a literary critic?

[2] p. 29.

[3] Monceaux, *op. cit.* pp. 231, 232.

from Fronto that Marcus Aurelius declared that he had learnt the truth[1].

As for his warmheartedness, it is characteristic of the man that he regrets the absence of a word for affection (*φιλοστοργία*) in the Roman tongue. "I suppose," he writes, "because no one at Rome is really *φιλόστοργος* (warmhearted), there is not even a Roman name for this virtue[2]." In another passage he applies to a friend the epithet philostorgus, "for which there is no word among the Romans[3]." The sentiment is unique, and corresponds with the reference to Fronto in the *Meditations* already quoted: "From Fronto I learned to observe...that generally those among us who are called Patricians are rather deficient in paternal affection[4]" (or "warmheartedness").

This affection pours itself out in sympathy, for his ideal in friendship is the sharing of sweet and bitter alike[5]. The letters of condolence to Sardius Saturninus[6] and to Herodes Atticus[7] are full of deep feeling, and even in his abandonment of sorrow for his little grandson, it is the grief of the young father and mother which he cannot bear to see. For himself he could bear it, for death cannot be far off[8], and "old age is a twilight and cannot last long[9]."

Not only his sympathy but also his unselfishness and his loyalty in friendship are well attested. He will not

[1] p. 49; "verum dicere ex te disco." Cf. Fronto's boast (p. 235): "verum dixi sedulo, verum audivi libenter." Cf. also the Greek letter in which he describes a birthday feast, from which he would exclude "whosoever loveth and maketh a lie"; (p. 243) ...*ἕτερον μέν τι κευθούσας ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλο δὲ λεγούσας.*

[2] p. 135. [3] p. 176. [4] *ἀστοργότεροι* (*Med.* I. 11).

[5] p. 185: "cum amico omnia amara et dulcia communicata velim."

[6] p. 187. [7] p. 244. [8] p. 232. [9] p. 197.

trouble Marcus to write to him when he is busy[1], though he longs for a letter; he refuses to abandon his friends when they incur the imperial displeasure. He writes thus about a certain Niger Censorinus, who, in appointing Fronto his heir, had been "indiscreet in his language[2]": "I rather think it is suggested that I ought to break off my friendship with him, on learning that his favour with you has suffered. It has never been my way to abandon, at the first rumour of adversity, friendships begun in prosperity. And besides (for why should I not speak out the thought in my mind?), the man who does not love you I shall reckon among my enemies, but the man who forfeits your love will be in my eyes not an enemy but an object of pity[3]." Niebuhr characteristically refuses Fronto any of the credit for this independent attitude, observing that it was only under Marcus Aurelius and Antoninus Pius[4] that a man could be the friend of the Emperor's enemy. Yet to take up such an attitude towards any emperor in the second century A.D. argues some strength of character and independence of spirit. Indeed, Fronto seems to have been singularly free from those vices which so often prove the destruction of the friends of the great, and at any rate he did not make his tutorial position the

[1] Cf. p. 50: "Nam quo mei amantior es, tanto me laborum tuorum parciorem et occupationum tuarum modestiorem esse oportet." He will not write himself lest Marcus feel bound to answer, preferring to incur the charge of laziness rather than to burden him with the task of writing in reply.

[2] p. 164.

[3] pp. 165, 166. Fronto takes endless trouble on behalf of his friends, and a large number of the *Epistulae ad Amicos* are letters of introduction and of recommendation.

[4] Cf. *Med.* VI. 30 (of Antoninus Pius): "he tolerated freedom of speech in those who opposed his opinions."

brilliant financial success which the Stoic philosopher, Seneca, made it under Nero[1].

Of Fronto's commonsense we have had more than one illustration. In the affair of Niger Censorinus it is once again to the fore. Writing to Cavius Maximus, another friend who had been displeased by Niger's conduct, he says: "It was not on your account that I began to love Niger, so that on your account I should cease to love him; nor was it on Niger's introduction that you began to love me. So I do beg of you that a friendship which has done us no service may do us no harm[2]." Again, upbraiding Marcus for not taking a real holiday, he asks: "Tell me, Marcus, did you go to Alsium so as to fast with a sea-view? What? Couldn't you wear yourself out with hunger and thirst and business at Lorium[3]?" One more example we may take from the discussion with Appian about the giving of presents[4]. Appian had asked why it was that, although cities receive offerings and money, though gods desire such gifts, and men accept legacies from friends who are dead, yet one man will not accept money from another. Fronto's reply is clear and to the point. After illustrating the difference between public and private codes on many points, he adds: "If you tell me that many cities accept such gifts, I could reply that many individuals accept them; but the point we are raising is whether it is right and fitting that they should accept

[1] pp. 134, 135: "Nostrae res haud copiosae." Cf. p. 235. Marcus presumably paid Fronto well, however, if we may judge by *Med.* I. 4: "(I learned) from my great-grandfather...to have good teachers at home and to know that on such things a man should spend liberally." According to the story in Gell. XIX. 10 Fronto was prepared to pay a good price for a new bath.

[2] p. 168. [3] p. 225. [4] pp. 245 ff.

them[1]." Nor is the case of the gods a parallel; "for it is not fitting to worship me as a god or as the King of the Persians." The rule he would lay down is that one may receive from a friend that for which one would not be ashamed to ask. Gifts, he thinks, should be "a mixture of much kindliness and very little expense[2]." For "a costly gift is not profitable to rich or poor, since the former does not need it and the latter cannot return it." "The small gift, on the contrary, is equally to the praise of the giver, for his kind thought, and the recipient, for his acceptance[3]."

Fronto's perpetual allusions to his ailments are certainly monotonous, although the monotony is somewhat relieved by their varied character. All through the period of the correspondence Fronto seems to have been such a martyr to gout[4], rheumatism and a host of other diseases that he was often weary of life. At times even the support of eloquence fails to sustain him. "I would rather not know the Greek or the Latin name for a single limb, if I could only pass my life free from that pain," he cries; or again, after a lengthy technical dissertation upon the use of metaphors, he ends: "The pain in my elbow is not much easier[5]." Nevertheless, in spite of constant ill-health, he lived a full and busy life, a life of remarkable literary and mental activity; and towards its close he could boast, looking back on the years that were gone, "I have looked to the care of my mind rather than of my body[6]." We could wish, perhaps, that he had discussed

[1] p. 248.

[2] p. 251: οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὰ ἄδικα κερδέα πτωχίαν πολλὴ μὲν οὐ φροντίδη ἐλαχίστῃ δὲ ἀναλώματι.

[3] p. 251. [4] Cf. Gell. XIX. 10. [5] p. 47.

[6] p. 235: "Animo potius quam corpori curando operam dedi."

his symptoms less frequently and with less detail; reticence was never one of his characteristics. Nevertheless to imply, as Monceaux has implied[1], that Fronto intentionally played the rôle of an invalid rather than go to his province in Asia, is absolutely unjustifiable. Fronto himself tells us that he made all preparations for his departure, hoping right up to the last that his old enemy would yield to treatment, but that he had to abandon the idea on the outbreak of a fresh attack[2]. There seems no reasonable ground for doubting his word[3], but Fronto is always in the position of the unfortunate dog with the bad name. Yet, when one gets to know him, one finds something attractive in this most enthusiastic of teachers and truest of friends.

[1] Monceaux, *op. cit.*, pp. 217, 218. [2] p. 169.

[3] The other province, which fell to Fronto's colleague, was Africa, which, as his native land, he would naturally have preferred; but from many points of view Asia was the more desirable province of the two. Cf. Lacour-Gayet, *Antonin Le Pieux*, Introduction, p. xiv: "Les deux proconsulats d'Asie et d'Afrique étaient équivalents aux yeux de la loi, puisqu'on tirait au sort l'un ou l'autre; mais il est bien probable que le proconsulat d'Asie devait être l'objet de plus de désirs, au moins pour ceux qui aimaient à se produire, que le proconsulat d'Afrique."

CONCLUSION.

THERE is little encouragement offered in these days to those who may seek to defend this Fronto, "the biggest fool who ever wrote[1]." "C'est aujourd'hui un lieu commun que de se moquer du pauvre Fronton. Ce serait jouer au paradoxe que d'entreprendre de le réhabiliter[2]," is Monceaux's verdict; while Madvig goes still further: "In tali materia et verbis et chartis parcere aequum est[3]." Nevertheless paper and words may not have been wholly wasted if in any degree it has been shown that the favourable criticism of the ancient world upon this Fronto was not so entirely misguided as a later age has supposed; that he sheds more light upon the characters, history and tendencies of his age than has been thought by those who have never read him; that, far from being responsible for the death of Roman Literature, he led a revival in style and language, interesting in itself and in comparison with corresponding movements in other countries, whereby that dead literature rose again to a new life; that even in his own writings grace and beauty are not unknown, and that as a literary critic he is not utterly despicable; if, in short,

[1] Cf. Priebe, *op. cit.*, "omnium qui unquam extiterunt scriptorum plane stultissimus."

[2] Monceaux, *op. cit.* p. 212.

[3] Madvig, *Adv. crit.* vol. II. p. 614.

there has been brought home once again the truth of those words of Tacitus which, in the cult of classicism that obscures our vision, deserve to be writ large on every page of Silver Age literary history: "nec statim deterius esse quod diversum est[1]."

Fronto is not a second Cicero; but the gulf between them is the gulf between genius and talent, not the gulf between genius and an insane and tasteless pedantry. For his own sake, for the sake of his pupils, and for the sake of the literary revival which he led, Fronto deserves a better fate than the contempt and the oblivion which have been his only portion in these latter days.

[1] Tac. *Dial.* 18.

AFRICAN LATINITY.

ζητῶ...ὅπου κατακλείσας εἶχες τοσοῦτον ἐσμὸν ἀτόπων καὶ διαστρόφων ὀνομάτων, ὧν τὰ μὲν αὐτὸς ἐποίησας, τὰ δὲ κατορωρυγμένα ποθὲν ἀνασπῶν...τοσοῦτον βόρβορον συνερανίσας κατήντλησάς μου.

LUCIAN, *Lexiphanes*, 17 (quoted by Kroll in *Rhein Mus.* 1897, p. 575).

N.B. All inscriptions are taken from the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, unless otherwise stated; those indicated by the number of the inscription only, without the number of the volume, are from Vol. VIII., which contains African inscriptions only. Those marked *E.* are from Vol. V. of *Ephemeris Epigraphica* (Rome and Berlin, 1884), and are also exclusively African; those marked "Orelli" are from Orelli's *Inscriptionum Latinarum selectarum amplissima collectio*, 3 vols. 1828.

In references to Latin authors the following editions and abbreviations have been used: those marked *C. S. E. L.* are from the series *Corpus Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, and those marked T. are Teubner texts. Editions are only specified in cases where confusion might arise owing to the different paging of various texts, e.g. in the case of Apuleius, to whom Koziol and others refer

by the paging of Hildebrand's 1842 edition (Leipzig), whereas more recent writers follow the 1900 Teubner text of Van der Vliet. For abbreviations of periodical publications vid. Bibliography.

Ap. Apuleius. Van der Vliet. Leipzig, 1900. T.
Arnob. Arnobius. A. Reifferscheid. Vienna, 1875. *C. S. E. L.* iv.
Aug. Augustine. *De civitate Dei.* B. Dombart. Leipzig, 1877. T.
„ *Confessiones.* P. Knoll. Leipzig, 1898. T.
Cass. Fel. Cassius Felix. V. Rose. Leipzig, 1879. T.
Cyp. Cyprian. G. Hartel. Vienna, 1868. *C. S. E. L.* iii.
Dracont. Dracontius. F. De Duhn. Leipzig, 1873. T. (Carmina minora.)
Ennod. Ennodius. G. Hartel. Vienna, 1882. *C. S. E. L.* vi.
Firm. Mat. Firmicus Maternus. C. Halm. Vienna, 1867. *C. S. E. L.* ii.
Flor. Florus. O. Rossbach. Leipzig, 1896. T.
Fr. Fronto. S. Naber. Leipzig, 1867. T.
Fulg. Fulgentius. R. Helm. Leipzig, 1898. T.
Gell. Aulus Gellius. C. Hosius. Leipzig, 1903. T.
Lact. Lactantius. S. Brandt and G. Laubmann. Vienna, 1893, etc. *C. S. E. L.* xxvii.
M. A. Marcus Aurelius. *Commentariorum libri XII* J. Stich. Leipzig, 1903. T.
„ *Epistulae*, ap. Fr., q.v.
Min. Fel. Minucius Felix. C. Halm. Vienna, 1867. *C. S. E. L.* ii.
Non. Nonius Marcellus. W. M. Lindsay. Leipzig, 1903. T.
Petron. Petronius. F. Bücheler. Berlin, 1895.
Tert. Tertullian. F. Oehler. Leipzig, 1853.
Val. Max. Valerius Maximus. C. Kempf. Leipzig, 1888. T.
Varro. Varro. *Saturae*, ap. Petron., q.v.
Vell. Pat. Velleius Paterculus. F. Haase. Leipzig, 1884. T.
Vict. Vit. Victor Vitensis. M. Petschenig. Vienna, 1881. *C. S. E. L.* vii.

African Latin has been described by one German critic as a "terra incognita[1]"—a description which is as true in one sense as it is misleading in another, since, strictly speaking, it is not the Latin of Africa but the contemporary Latin of other countries which is unknown ground, and it is our ignorance of the latter which obscures our judgment of the former.

The notable Latin authors of the second and third centuries of our era fall into two classes,—those who were Africans by birth, such as Fronto, Apuleius, Tertullian and Cyprian, and those whose birthplace is unknown, but who, like Aulus Gellius, came at some period of their life under the influence of African teachers. Roman and Italian literature was for the time exhausted, the Spanish school of the first century A.D. had come to an end with Martial, and the day of Gaul had not yet dawned. Literature was almost exclusively in the hands of Africans.

In the absence, therefore, of contemporary non-African Latin with which to compare the work of the African school, it becomes difficult to discern whether the Latin which they spoke and wrote was a distinct dialect, differing from the contemporary Latin of other countries in vocabulary, syntax, pronunciation and style, or whether it was in the main the Latin of an epoch rather than that of a locality. Around this question keen discussion has raged during the last thirty years in Germany and the last fifteen in France. Literary and inscriptional evidence has been produced, and ignored, with equal zeal on either side, and the problem has been further complicated by the champions of the dialect theory, who have assumed as

[1] G. Bernhardy, *Grundriss der röm. Lit.* p. 323.

Africans certain authors of unknown origin (such as Manilius and Aulus Gellius), apparently on the ground that we do not know them to have been born elsewhere. It is a theory which, if conscientiously applied, would considerably increase the birth-rate of Africa.

It was the famous scholar, Dr Karl Sittl, who first opened the battle in earnest, by propounding, in his *Die lokale Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache*[1], the view that African Latin was a distinct dialect, whose peculiar characteristics were due to the influence of climate, surroundings, national temperament and the circumstances under which the Latin tongue was first established in Africa. Many eminent scholars, notably Landgraf, Wölfflin, Bernhardy and Ott[2], supported and developed this view. Nine years later, however, Sittl himself recanted, and in the *Jahresbericht* for 1891[3] proceeded to demolish his own theory. His change of view did not prevent subsequent champions of Africanism from quoting largely from his earlier work. In a multitude of learned periodicals there is safety, and the recantation, which did not attain to the dignity and notoriety of book form, was often tactfully ignored.

Learned works on individual African authors stimulated the discussion, and against the dialect theory were ranged, among others, Jordan, Becker, Kretschmann, Max. Hoffman, Kaulen, Rönsch, Kroll, Schuchardt, Vogel, Kübler and Norden[4], some of whom, however, admit the existence of an African *style*. In France the question

[1] Published at Erlangen in 1882.

[2] For references see Bibliography.

[3] *Jahresbericht* (Bursian-Müller), vol. 68, 1891, pp. 226 ff.

[4] For references see Bibliography.

was first discussed in detail by Monceaux, an ardent disciple of Wölfflin, in the first volume of *Les Africains*[1]. In his review of this volume Boissier[2] opposed the dialect theory, and he subsequently developed his position in greater detail in an article on Commodianus[3], and in his book on Roman Africa[4]. Other French scholars have supported him. Ferrère, Leclercq, Brénous, Pirson, Aug. Dubois, and René Pichon[5], all challenge, from various points of view, the position of Wölfflin and Monceaux. These opponents of "Africitas" do not deny that certain characteristics of style and language are found extensively, or for the first time, in African authors; but, whether they regard these characteristics as due to the hot African temperament, or whether (with Norden[6]) they see in the "tumor Africus" Asianism in a Latin garb, or (with Sittl[7]) "Apuleian rhetoric," they deny that these peculiarities are sufficiently numerous or striking to justify a belief in an African Latin dialect, or even in any one consistent African style. They see rather in these so-called Africanisms merely the features which Latin exhibited all over the Empire in that period when Classicism

[1] P. Monceaux, *Les Africains*, vol. I. Paris, 1894; cf. esp. ch. iv. on "Le Latin d'Afrique." Aubé, in *Revue Archéologique*, 1881, had already observed how the influence of writing tends towards the suppression of provincialism.

[2] G. Boissier in *Journ. d. Sav.* 1895, pp. 35—46.

[3] In *Mélanges Renier*, pp. 51 ff.

[4] G. Boissier, *Roman Africa* (translation by Arabella Ward). London and New York, 1899.

[5] In *Les derniers écrivains profanes. Étude sur l'histoire de la littérature latine dans les Gaules*, 1906. For other references see Bibliography.

[6] In *Der antike Kunstprosa*. Leipzig, 1904.

[7] In *Jahresbericht*, 1891, p. 236: "das sogenannte afrikanische Latein ist grösstentheils apuleianische Rhetorik."

was on the wane and when vulgar Latin was finding its way into literature; although they admit that in the majority of the African authors these characteristics were to some extent moulded by the natural bias of the African temperament towards exuberance and exaggeration of every kind. Further, they insist with perfect justice upon the invalidity of the chronological argument (as applied to the champions of "Africitas"), in view of the absence of contemporary non-African work. The occurrence of a certain word for the first time in an African author cannot, under the circumstances, stamp it as a local usage.

The question has received little attention at the hands of scholars of this country, save for an article on Cyprian by E. W. Watson[1] (in which its bearing upon the Latin of the Christian Church is briefly considered), and G. N. Olcott's introduction to his book on Latin inscriptions[2]. It is this fact alone which justifies an attempt like the present to deal with a highly technical subject within the limits of a single chapter, the aim of which is to give a brief survey of the leading aspects of the question and to co-ordinate literary and inscriptional evidence, rather than to propound an original theory.

In order to form an opinion as to the peculiar characteristics of African Latin, it is necessary to recapitulate briefly the previous development of the Latin language and especially to consider the relations within that language of the popular and "classical" elements.

[1] In Vol. IV. of *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica* (Essay 5). Oxford, 1896.

[2] G. N. Olcott, *Studies in the Word-formation of the Latin inscriptions*. Rome, 1898.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

à mesure qu'il se développe ou tente de se fixer, on en voit mieux apparaître le caractère artificiel[1]."

The language which is artificial, the language which only scholars understand, is doomed; and the doom of the "sermo urbanus" was hastened by excessive and pedantic purism. In their speech, as we shall see, men had to include the words and phrases and constructions of the popular tongue; even the purist cannot talk like a book in all the emergencies of daily life. But as regarded written Latin the worship of "auctoritas," without which no word was safe[2], was carried to extremes. The famous maxim of Caesar, "Shun every strange and unusual word like a rock[3]," would suggest, if one took it seriously, that he regarded the Latin language as fixed and hermetically sealed by his day. On this principle Latin would have been reduced to a dead language in its lifetime.

The inevitable result followed, and side by side with the "sermo urbanus," the language of literature, there grew up, developing naturally on the lips of the unlearned, the "sermo plebeius[4]." It is not an off-shoot of the

[1] *Ib.* p. 434.

[2] Cf. Cic. *pro Sestio*, 115 (on *favor*), and Quint. VIII. 3. 34 ("favorem et urbanum Cicero nova credit").

[3] Quoted in Gell. I. 10. 4, from Caesar's *de Analogia*: "habe semper in memoria atque pectore ut tamquam scopulum sic fugias inauditum et insolens verbum." On Cicero's purism cf. Dräger, *Hist. Synt.* I. pp. 14 ff. Cf. Gell. X. 21. 2, XIII. 21. 22.

[4] For a detailed and most interesting discussion of the vexed question of vulgar Latin see F. G. Mohl's *Introduction à la chronologie du Latin Vulgaire*. Paris, 1899. (In Vol. 122 of "Bibliothèque de l'école des Hautes Études.") Mohl maintains throughout that there is no essential distinction between vulgar and classical Latin, the former being simply "le latin littéraire parlé par le peuple," and insists upon the unity of vulgar Latin, but he differentiates between the Latin of Italy and the Latin of

"sermo urbanus," but the two, which are descended from a common source (the old Latin, "prisca Latinitas"), are twin languages[1], and the difference between them is one not of nature but merely of degree[2]. But although the existence of this "sermo plebeius" is unquestionable[3], our knowledge of its characteristics is not so extensive as we might expect; for in the first place, as soon as a man takes a pen in his hand, he begins to choose his words, to reflect and to reject, and it is unhappily true that "mit Bewusstsein hat Niemand vulgär geschrieben[4]"; and in the second place, even if an uneducated man tries to write just as he speaks, he does not generally succeed. Nor have we any folksongs or fairy tales to guide us, and the grammarians give us very little assistance, for they often confuse vulgarism with poetical licence, and in-

the provinces over-seas, the former being, he considers, far more deeply influenced by the "rusticitas" of the kindred Italiot dialects than was the latter by the various foreign tongues with which it came in contact. Further, the republican romanisation of Italy was a natural process, the imperial romanisation of the provinces artificial. In Italy Latin assimilated indigenous dialects, finally absorbing them into the "Italian Latin"; in the provinces Latin was officially substituted for the native tongues. Cf. esp. pp. 266 ff.

[1] Cf. Schuchardt, *Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins*. Leipzig, 1866–68, p. 47. "Der *Sermo plebeius* steht zum *Sermo urbanus* in keinem Descendenz-, in keinem Ascendenz-, sondern in einem Kollateralverhältniss."

[2] Cf. Boissier in *J. des Sav.* 1892, p. 98 (a review of Max Bonnet's *Le Latin de Gregoire de Tours*). "Je crois donc qu'à Rome, entre la langue des lettrés et celle du peuple, qu'avec raison on réprésente parfaitement vivante et toujours en mouvement, il pouvait y avoir une différence de degré; il n'y avait pas une différence de nature." He compares "popular" French, which is not a *patois*.

[3] Cf. Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata*, pp. 12—14, for list of references to plebeian Latin. Cf. Cic. *ad Fam.* I. 1. 2 and IX. 21, Quint. I. 5. 10, Petron. 118, Gell. I. 10.

[4] Sittl, *Jahresbericht*, 1891, p. 227.

variably treat it with scorn, inasmuch as it shows a perverse disposition to disobey their favourite rules. In fact scholars in general despise it, and find it necessary to apologise for using a "popular" word, so that, save for the inscriptions, whose evidence we shall consider later, our direct knowledge of vulgar Latin is confined to a few words marked "vulgo" or the like in various authors. We can, however, collect a certain amount of indirect evidence about it, for we find traces of it in various forms.

Grandgent has defined vulgar Latin as "the speech of the middle-classes as it grew out of early classical Latin ...distinct from the consciously polite utterance of cultivated society, from the brogue of the country and from the slang of the lowest quarters of the city, though affected by all of these[1]." But the very species of Latin from which he differentiates the "sermo vulgaris" are rather the various forms which vulgar Latin assumed in different surroundings, for all alike show that spontaneity which is everywhere the essential characteristic of popular speech. "The 'sermo vulgaris,'" says Oleott, "is not so much the language of ignorance as the *natural* language[2]." In the first place it appears, as we have said, in the conversation of the educated, and from there slips into their familiar correspondence. In this form it is known as the "sermo cotidianus[3]" and is found on the lips of the

[1] C. H. Grandgent, *An introduction to Vulgar Latin*. Boston, 1907, p. 3.

[2] Cf. Oleott, *op. cit.* p. xiv. He adds that the difficulty of dealing with it lies in its want of stability, for it is "not a language at all in the sense of a linguistic unit, but a mass of variations and peculiarities continually shifting and changing in place and time."

[3] Cf. Quint. XII. 10. 40, "cotidiano sermoni simillima, quo cum amicis, coniugibus, liberis, servis loquamur, contento promere animi voluntatem nihilque et arcessiti et elaborati requirente." Cf. Cic. *ad Fam.* IX. 21. 1, and cf. *ad Att.* I. 16 for an example of a familiar letter.

characters in old Comedy, in the Letters of Cicero and especially in those of Caelius, in the extracts given by Suetonius from the conversation and correspondence of Augustus[1], in the satire of Petronius, in which it is deliberately parodied, in occasional anecdotes, and here and there even in classical authors. All these sources, however, are more or less vitiated, for Greek metres hamper comedy and satire, rhetoric and the Hellenistic setting have left their mark on the novel of Petronius, and of the Letters which have come down to us comparatively few are really natural and confidential[2]. The vulgar Latin of the peasants, "rusticitas," was to be found, according to Fronto[3], in the *Atellanae*. But the fragments still extant are too slight to be of much value. Nor do the slaves of the *Palliata* help us, for at that early date dramatic realism did not attain to the reproduction of a "sermo servilis," and the slave talked the language of his master[4]. A third form of vulgar Latin, intermediate between the "rusticitas" of the country and the "sermo cotidianus" of the capital, is distinguished by Sittl[5] in the "oppidanum dicendi genus," the speech of the small towns.

[1] Cf. Suet. *Vit. Aug.* 87, "cotidiano sermone quaedam frequentius et notabiliter usurpasse eum litterae ipsius autographae ostentant...ponit assidue et pro stulto baceolum, et pro pullo pulleianeum, et pro cerito vacerrosum, et vapide se habere pro male, et betizare pro languere, quod vulgo lachanizare dicitur."

[2] Cf. Sittl, *Jahresbericht*, 1891, p. 244; "Was ist Vulgär-Latein?" in *d. Verh. der* 40. *Vers. deutsch. Phil. u. Schülm.* pp. 385 ff. Leipzig, 1889.

[3] Fr. p. 62, "Animadvertas...elegantis Novium et Pomponium et id genus in verbis rusticanis et iocularibus ac ridiculariis."

[4] Cf. P. Wahrmann, "Vulgär-lateinisch bei Terenz," in *W. Stud.* 1908, Pt 1., pp. 75 ff.

[5] In "Was ist Vulgär-Latein?" *sup. cit.* p. 10. Cf. Cic. *Brut.* 242, "oppidano quodam et incondito genere dicendi."

The language of Vitruvius and that of the *bellum Hispanum* and the *bellum Africanum* have been claimed as vulgar Latin, but their technical jargon is neither classical nor vulgar; it is simply bad. Vitruvius, for all his modesty[1], made a desperate attempt to write good classical Latin. It is true that he failed, but no one can read a page of his laborious composition without realising that it is not the work of a man writing easily and without thought the language which he speaks; and the same is true of those who continued Caesar's narrative, although we are perhaps a degree nearer spoken Latin here than in the maze of Vitruvius' architectural intricacies.

There is also a certain amount of popular Latin in some of the jurists—such as Scaevola, Papinian, Ulpian and Paulus[2].

Another important source of evidence is, of course, the Romance languages, which are the offspring of the "sermo plebeius" and not of the "sermo urbanus." But the influences which were brought to bear upon them during their development were so various that their evidence must be used with caution. The truth is that no written evidence can be absolutely trustworthy concerning what was largely, until the African period, a spoken product only[3]. Further, in examining all literary

[1] Cf. Vitruv. VIII. 8, "non enim architectus potest esse grammaticus."

[2] Kübler in *Archiv*, VIII. pp. 161 ff., suggests that this is due to the fact that these jurists studied at a time when Fronto and Apuleius were supreme in the rhetorical schools.

[3] Cf. W. Kroll, "Das afrikanische Latein" in *Rhein. Mus.* LII., 1897, p. 573, "Nur der Sprechende kann die Sprache unbefangen handhaben."

evidence we have to allow for the tendency of copyists to correct vulgarisms in their manuscripts; and we shall see that even inscriptional evidence, the writing in the catacombs, the Pompeian "graffiti" and the wax-tablets are not infallible guides.

With the decay of classical Latin and the disappearance of the aristocracy who knew it, popular Latin gradually made its way into literature, its progress being fostered by the extension of the Roman domination[1] and the influx of the provincials into Rome and her literary life. Then came Christianity, and since it was among the common folk that the new faith spread, the "sermo plebeius" naturally became its organ—indeed the creation of a new theological vocabulary was only possible in the living speech. Nevertheless, although style became subservient to the winning of souls[2], the victory of popular Latin over its rival was not yet complete. It was only the educated who could write and translate, and, since the only education was rhetorical, rhetoric and the traditions of Classicism still held sway. For, even when style is no longer his first care, the converted rhetorician is still a stylist, and rhetoric still influences Tertullian[3], Minucius Felix, Lactantius, Arnobius[4], and St Augustine.

[1] Cf. Monceaux, *Le Latin Vulgaire*, *sup. cit.* pp. 436 ff.

[2] Cf. Aug. *Enarr. in Psalm.* 138. 20, "melius est reprehendant nos grammatici quam non intellegant populi."

[3] Cf. esp. the *de Pallio*; cf. E. W. Watson, *op. cit.* p. 200. "The *de Pallio* with its elaborate antitheses and assonance and all the artificial graces of its time, its minimum of Christianity and its adulation of the Severi, is as clearly written for the sake of words as Fronto's praises of Smoke or Dust or anything in the *Florida* of Apuleius."

[4] For Arnobius' nominal scorn for form and beauty of expression, cf. 1. 58 and 59 etc.

Indeed the victory of the "sermo plebeius" was only finally assured by the inroad of the northern barbarians, who could not learn the literary idiom and adopted the popular Latin which they found everywhere around them[1]. Classical Latin fell with the Empire of which it was the official organ.

We have, then, to consider to what extent the Latin language, whose two-fold growth we have briefly traced, developed, when taken to the provinces, into provincialism.

Latin was imported into Africa at the time of the Roman conquest, after the Punic Wars. It was the official language, was obligatory upon those who became Roman citizens[2] and spread rapidly even among the common people. The numerous epitaphs which have been found in Africa, written in Latin too ungrammatical and too mis-spelt to be the work of scholars and obviously in memory of people in humble circumstances, prove that here there lived a community who spoke and wrote Latin, though they spoke and wrote it badly[3]. In spite of the rivalry of Greek, Libyan and Punic, Latin prevailed. Punic was a mere *patois* in St Augustine's day, though it still survived, especially in the country districts[4]; Greek, which from the second century onwards was steadily giving way to Latin even in the neighbourhood of Carthage, was by his time hardly heard; while the native

[1] Cf. Monceaux, *op. cit.* p. 443.

[2] Cf. Aug. *Civ. Dei*, XIX. 7: "opera data est ut imperiosa civitas non solum iugum, verum etiam linguam suam domitis gentibus imponeret." Pliny (*N. H.* XVIII. 3. 22) tells us that after the conquest of Africa the Romans gave libraries to the African princes and had the books of Mago translated into Latin.

[3] Cf. Boissier, *Rom. Af.* p. 319.

[4] *Vid. inf.* p. 176 and note.

Libyan, or Berber, was despised and ignored, although in the end it was to triumph over them all in the history of this strange people, "little resistant," as Boissier calls them, "yet very persistent[1]."

The strongest argument in favour of an African Latin dialect is the argument from probability, "cum Latinitas," as Jerome[2] says, "et regionibus quotidie mutetur et tempore." The influence of national characteristics upon the language of a people is so certain that it would seem only natural to go a step further and find that influence working upon an imported language, introducing new features, developing some and suppressing others, until it has stamped its mark upon it. Moreover the ultimate differentiation of Latin into the Romance languages points in this direction, and there exists a certain amount of direct literary evidence for the working of this process upon Latin at an earlier date. Quintilian, for example, insists in this connection upon the danger of learning Greek too long: "hoc enim accidunt et oris plurima vitia in peregrinum sonum corrupti et sermonis[3]." Cicero speaks of the foreign accent of poets born at Corduba[4], of the pernicious influence of provincials generally upon the speech of Rome[5], of the peculiarities of the Gallic vocabulary and

[1] Boissier, *Rom.* p. 335. The only words which Dräger gives as coming from the African language into Latin are *nepus* (scorpion) and *lalisio* (wild ass).

[2] Hieron. *Comm. in Galat.* ii. 3. [3] Quint. i. 1. 13.

[4] Cic. *pro Archia*, 26: "qui praesertim usque eo de suis rebus scribi cuperet, ut etiam Cordubae nati poetis, pingue quiddam sonantibus atque peregrinum, tamen aures suas dederet."

[5] Cic. *Brut.* 74. 258: "sed hanc certe rem deteriorem vetustas facit, et Romae et in Graecia. Confluxerunt enim Athenas et in hanc urbem multi inquinate loquentes ex diversis locis, quo magis expurgandus est sermo."

pronunciation, and of the *urbanitas* which was to be found only in Rome[1].

The very fact that Punic lived on in Africa till long after the second century A.D.[2] and that Libyan still survives would lead us to suppose that these two tongues reacted upon Latin in that country, and it is true that a little direct literary evidence exists for peculiarities in language or pronunciation on the part of Africans who spoke and wrote Latin.

The evidence for provincial pronunciation is not confined to Africa. With Cicero's censure upon the Gallic rhetoricians we may compare the reference in Quintilian[3]

[1] *ib.* 46. 171: "Et Brutus, 'Qui est,' inquit, 'iste tandem urbanitatis color?' 'Nescio,' inquam, 'tantum esse quendam scio. Id tu, Brute, iam intelleges cum in Galliam veneris: audies tu quidem etiam verba quaedam non trita Romae, sed haec mutari dediscique possunt; illud est maius, quod in vocibus nostrorum oratorum retinuit quiddam et resonat urbanius, nec hoc in oratoribus modo apparet sed etiam in ceteris." Cf. P. Geyer in *Archiv* II. pp. 25 ff. He attempts to establish the existence of a Gallic Latinity, but his evidence is too slight to be convincing.

[2] Cf. Aug. *Ep.* 108. 14: "per Punicum interpretem"; *ib.* 209. 3: "aptum loco illi congruumque requirebam qui et Punica lingua esset instructus." In the diocese of Hippo it was necessary for a priest to have a knowledge of Punic. Boissier (in *J. des Sav.* 1895 pp. 35 ff.) points out that Monceaux goes too far in deducing from this passage that priests in general needed to know Punic. "Parcequ' aujourd'hui encore on ne choisit, pour certaines paroisses de Morbihan ou de Finistère, que des curés qui puissent prêcher en bas-breton, dira-t-on que le bas-breton est parlé couramment par tout le clergé de France?" It is noteworthy that there is no Phoenician Christian literature, a fact which suggests that Christianity took no more real hold upon the Phoenicians than upon the Berbers. Punic seems to have been failing in Augustine's time, for he gives a Latin translation of some Punic words, adding "Latine vobis dicam quia Punice non omnes nostis." (*Serm.* 167. 3.)

[3] Quint. I. 5. 12.

to Tinga[1], an orator of Placentia, who pronounced *pergula* as *precula*. For Spain, too, we have the testimony of the elder Seneca to the Spanish expressions of Porcius Latro[2] and that of Spartianus to Hadrian's imperial despatch[3], which was ridiculed on account of his provincial delivery. "Nam sonis homines, ut aera tinnitu, dinoscimus[4]." As evidence for peculiarities in African pronunciation we have the criticism of Spartianus upon Septimus Severus[5], "afrum quiddam usque ad senectutem sonans," and upon his sister, "vix latine loquens[6]"; while Jerome[7] speaks of the "stridor punicus." On the other hand it has been observed that Severus and his sister were natives of Leptis, a town on the east coast, which remained especially Phoenician, and in which Punic and Greek were spoken, but not Latin, and that Fronto of Cirta, like Aper of Nîmes, passed at Rome for the best rhetorician of his day. For in spite of the few passages quoted above, and in spite of strong probability in favour of local peculiarities of pronunciation, inscriptional evidence shows that the pronunciation of Latin must have been much the same in all the provinces of the Empire. The only peculiarities for which direct evidence has been found are neglect of quantity[8],

[1] Quint. I. 5. 12.

[2] Sen. *Cont.* I. pref. 16. The Roman state did nothing at this time for the schools, so that, as we saw, the officers of Augustus' reign could not write good Latin.

[3] Spart. *Vit. Hadr.* 3.

[4] Quint. XI. 3. 31.

[5] Cf. Spart. *Vit. Sept. Sev.* 19.

[6] *ib.* 15.

[7] Hieron. *Ep.* 130. 5.

[8] Consentius (quoted in Keil, *Gram. Lat.* v. p. 392): "ut quidam dicunt 'piper,' producta priore syllaba, cum sit brevis, quod vitium Afrorum familiare est." Cf. *ib.*: "ut si quis dicat 'orator,' correpta priore syllaba, quod ipsum vitium Afrorum speciale est." Cf. Aug. *de doct. Christ.* IV. 24: "Afrae aures de correptione vocalium vel productione non iudicant."

labdacism[1], and the interchange of B and V[2]. Of these the first, neglect of quantity, is due to the fact that Latin was in a state of decay, and that, with the triumph of popular Latin, versification tended to be accentual or rhythmical rather than quantitative[3]. It is a feature of vulgar Latin in general, and instances are only especially numerous in Africa because it is in that country that the largest number of inscriptions in verse is to be found. As to the other two so-called Africanisms, nothing is commoner in the inscriptions of all countries[4]. As far as direct evidence as to specific Africanisms goes, there is nothing to suggest that the Latin of Africa was in any way peculiar.

Apart from such evidence, however, it is possible to

[1] Cf. Isidorus, *Orig.* I. 32. 8: "labdacismus est, si pro uno L duo pronuntientur, ut Afri faciunt, sicut colloquium pro coloquium." (This particular instance is not labdacism at all, but simply assimilation of *con-l* into *coll.*) Cf. Pomp. Maur. *Comm. Art. Donat.* quoted in Keil, *Gram. Lat.* v. p. 287: "labdacismis scatent Afri, raro est ut aliquis dicat L." For labdacism outside Africa cf. *C. I. L. pass.* Cf. II. (Spain) 2661 (Aurelli), 6257. 16 (Faustulli), 3479 (millia), etc. It is also common in Catalan. Cf. Spanish larga, Catalan llarga; Sp. luminoso, Catalan lluminos; Sp. Lucifer, Catalan Llucifé; Sp. lengua, Catalan llengua, etc. Cf. also Sp. llevar (to carry), llegar (to arrive), etc.

[2] Cf. Isid. III. App. p. 504, Arev. Rome, 1798: "birtus, boluntas, bita, vel his similia, quae Afri scribendo vitiant, omni modo reicienda sunt, et non per B sed V scribenda." (Cf. note *ad loc.*: "vitium scribendi B per V, uti etiam contra V per B, medio aevo apud multas nationes invaluit; et etiamnunc nonnullis Hispanis commune est, ut promiscue B et V usurpent, et proferant.")

[3] *Vid. inf.* For bad verses in other provinces cf. indices to *C. I. L.* e.g. IV. p. 781 (Pompeian wall-writings; cf. 1679, 1837, 1939, 2066, etc.).

[4] For $b = v$ and $v = b$ cf. indices to *C. I. L*; instances are so universal and so numerous that it is unnecessary to quote. Cf. e.g. X. p. 1171, XIV. p. 587. For $ll = l$ *vid. sup.*

collect, from the extant writings of African authors, a number of usages, stylistic and linguistic, which occur first or chiefly in writers of African birth, and some which occur solely in such writers. As regards those which occur first in African authors of the second and third centuries of our era, we have already seen the fallacy of assuming such usages to be Africanisms, since, in the absence of contemporary non-African literature, the chronological test cannot in fairness be applied. It is a point upon which too much stress cannot be laid, in view of the use made by the leading champions of *Africitas* of the argument from chronology[1]. Again, as we briefly noted, these scholars have made confusion worse confounded by claiming as African writers whose birthplace is unknown. Monceaux, for instance, in *Les Africains*, includes Aulus Gellius, Manilius, Florus[2], and even Pertinax, who, as Boissier pointed out, was born, according to Capitolinus, in the Apennines; also Porphyrio, Macrobius and Severus[3], whose African origin has not yet been conclusively proved. In fact it is precisely these assumptions which destroy the validity of Monceaux's arguments. In order to prove the existence of an African local dialect, it is absolutely essential that those authors

[1] It has been pointed out by Kroll (*op. cit.* p. 570) that this argument involves also the false assumption that "das zuerst Überlieferte müsse auch das zuerst Vorhandene sein."

[2] There are three persons who bear this name in Roman literature—a rhetorican, a poet, and a historian; very probably they are one, but Otto Jahn thinks it too rash to assert so. Monceaux simply declares there was one Florus, and that he was an African.

[3] Cf. Von Hoven (quoted by Kroll, *op. cit.* p. 571, from Lindner's Minucius, 1773, p. 301): "ut si hos omnes Afros fuisse velis, apud quos Africismi occurrunt, iam nullum amplius Romanum reliquum facturus sis."

in whom "Africanisms" are found should be proved beyond all doubt to have been born in Africa or to have lived for a considerable time under the local influence of that country. For Monceaux to insist upon the occurrence of Africanisms in an author like Manilius (who is not only a dubious "African," but was not apparently influenced to any extent by African teachers) is simply suicidal to his theory; for his arguments as to the birth-place of Manilius are so unconvincing[1] that they raise the inevitable question, "what if Manilius was not an African?" Manilius, according to Monceaux, exhibits various Africanisms; if he is not an African we arrive at the conclusion that Africanisms are not peculiar to Africa. Africanisms in a non-African author demolish the dialect theory at a blow, and the champion of *Africitas* has played into the hands of the enemy.

Again, to reinforce the ranks of African authors by a man like Aulus Gellius seems absolutely to vitiate the argument for an African *style*, for which, whether one calls it Latin Asianism or not, there is far more to be said than for an African dialect. Aulus Gellius, one of the men, as Hertz says, who will talk of cuneiform

[1] I must admit that I cannot follow Monceaux's reasoning on this point. He seems to me to argue in a circle, somewhat as follows: (1) We are nowhere told that Manilius is not an African. (2) His style and vocabulary resemble those of African authors, especially Apuleius and Fronto. (3) Therefore M. is an African. (4) But we have seen that he has many of the features of style and vocabulary found in African authors (cf. 2). (5) He too has been shown to be an African (cf. 3). (6) Therefore we have found corroboratory evidence as to the existence of an African dialect, and these particular usages may be called Africanisms. In venturing to disagree, however, with some of Monceaux's conclusions, I would like to express my great indebtedness to his most graphic and delightful book.

inscriptions by the falls of Niagara, has nothing of the heat, nothing of the oriental temperament of Apuleius[1]. His very exaggerations are formal, and his pleonasms are the pleonasms of a man who has been taught in the schools to say more than he means.

The so-called Africanisms can be roughly classified under four heads: archaisms, vulgarisms, graecisms and rhetorical usages. These subdivisions are, however, by no means mutually exclusive, the extensive use of the diminutive, for example, being a feature of vulgar Latin (both archaic and later) and also a rhetorical artifice. There also remain a certain number of words and phrases and certain varieties of word formation which have been claimed as peculiar to African authors and inscriptions.

It has already been shown that *archaism* was a long-growing tendency, developed and systematised, but not created, by the Frontonian school[2]; and that its prevalence

[1] The name Gellius appears in Gallic and Spanish inscriptions as well as in Africa. Cf. *C. I. L.* II. 5218, 186, 4970 (214), etc. (Spain); IX. 1978, 2090, 276 (Calabria, Apulia, etc.); XII. 2927, 1882, 5690, etc. (Gall. Narb.); cf. also X. 1074, 1083, 8099, etc. (S. Italy, Sicily and Sardinia); XIV. 3523, 1084, etc. (Latium); III. *pass. vid.* Index (Illyricum and the East); VII. 631 and 177 (Britain). Monceaux also urges in support of Gellius' African origin the fact that he was a pupil of Apollonius of Carthage. But Apollonius did not presumably confine his instruction to Africans. Foreign tutors were regularly employed to instruct young Romans, and we know that Gellius was also taught by the Gallic Favorinus and the Spaniard Antoninus Julianus. In spite of many fragments of autobiography in the *Noctes Atticae* telling of the author's childhood and youth at Rome, his journey to Greece, etc., there is no mention of Africa, except for a few casual allusions to Hannibal and the Punic war. Boissier therefore concludes that he was born in or near Rome. Th. Vogel in *Jahrbuch*, 1883 (review of Sittl's *Lok. Versch. sup. cit.*), pp. 172 ff., thinks it likely that he was an Italian, influenced by the African school. In view of this influence nothing will be deduced in this chapter from the *Noctes Atticae* as evidence against *Africitas*.

[2] Cf. *sup.* on *Archaism*, ch. III.

in later authors is largely due to the influence of Fronto, Apuleius, and other conscious archaists. It is not, then, a local African invention. Nevertheless there is a marked tendency on the part of champions of *Africitas* to claim all archaism as a distinctive feature of African Latin[1], and, ignoring the evidence for the growth of this archaizing tendency from Sallust right on to Hadrian, to maintain that its presence in the African authors is simply due to the preservation of Latin in Africa in much the same form as that in which it was first imported. In other words, we are to suppose that the Africans who spoke and wrote Latin spoke and wrote it after the manner of Plautus and Cato right on till the second century A.D., and that therefore, when they began to have a literature, that literature was naturally archaic. The theory is so improbable that it would seem almost unnecessary to refute it, were it not soberly put forward by such eminent scholars as Wölfflin and Monceaux, who urge as modern parallels the history of French in Canada or of English in the United States; cases which are not true parallels, inasmuch as in both these countries the colonists severed their ties with the mother-country to some extent, whereas between Africa and Rome there was constant communication, military and commercial, and political[2].

[1] Cf. L. Dalmassi, "L' arcaismo nell' Octavius di Minucio Felice," in *Riv. di fil.* vol. 37, 1909, pp. 7—37. Cf. *ib.* p. 36: "Arcaismo ripetiamo, e non africanismo. Mancano al dialogo Minuciano, o non compaiono che in troppo scarsa misura, quei caratteri che parvero più sicuramente e più strettamente Africani, semitismi o punismi o ebraismi che si vogliano dire."

[2] Cf. L. R. Holme, *Christian Churches in North Africa*, ch. 2: "There was constant trade between Africa and Rome, for Rome depended on Africa for her corn supply, and to Rome Africa owed her government, defence and culture."

No country can be completely latinised at its conquest[1]; therefore, in order to explain the archaisms in African Latin according to Monceaux's theory, we must assume that during three centuries of extensive commercial relations between Rome and Africa the colonists succeeded in preserving their language in its original form and in protecting it from the influence of the subsequent developments which Latin underwent in the capital. In his desire to study African literature "from Carthage and not from Rome[2]" Monceaux has not allowed sufficiently for reciprocal influences. African literature was not an independent growth, and any attempt to study it as such must lead to false conclusions.

It is not surprising that a theory resting on such an assumption has had still more extraordinary developments. One scholar has actually claimed to determine the condition of vulgar Latin at the moment of each

[1] This was certainly not the case with Africa. Cf. Mommsen, *Provinces of the Roman Empire from Caesar to Diocletian*, II. ch. 13, p. 306: "Under the Republic it (i.e. Africa) had not a history"; *ib.* p. 308: "with the dictator Caesar the civilising and latinising of Africa took their place among the tasks of the Roman government." It was Claudius and the Flavians who carried on Caesar's work. In Cicero's time Africa was still regarded as the haunt of barbarians. Cf. *ad Quint. Frat.* I. 1. 27, where Cicero consoles Quintus, who is in Asia, by asking: "quid si te sors Afris aut Hispanis aut Gallis praefecisset, inanibus ac barbaris nationibus?"

[2] Cf. Monceaux, *Les Africains*, Pref. p. iv: "C'est donc de Carthage et non de Rome, qu'il faut étudier l'évolution intellectuelle de l'Afrique romaine. Ainsi s'explique la méthode suivie dans cet ouvrage. La région d'Atlas y est considerée comme vivant d'une vie independante dans un coin de l'empire." Monceaux goes on to speak of the reciprocal influences of literature in general, but he attaches too little importance to them throughout his book.

provincial conquest by the specific traits of the languages spoken in the various countries to-day[1]. Thus from Sardian dialects he would trace the characteristics of vulgar Latin of about 250 B.C., and from Provençal those of vulgar Latin of about 121 B.C. "Il paraît croire," comments Boissier, "que chaque province s'est ouverte une fois pour laisser entrer le vainqueur, et s'est aussitôt renfermée à jamais pour garder pieusement le dépôt du Latin que lui enseigna la première légion implantée sur son sol[2]." The whole theory arose from an erroneous and far-fetched attempt to explain the archaistic movement. The substratum of truth which gives it a certain plausibility is the close connection which does unquestionably exist between archaism and vulgarism[3]; and which is due to the fact that old words and usages often live on in the popular speech, long after they have been banished from literature.

But the greater proportion of the archaisms in the conscious archaists, such as Fronto, Apuleius, Aulus Gellius, and Arnobius, found acceptance not because they were still living words on African lips, but because they were sacred by reason of their appearance in the old Latin literature; while on the other hand such archaisms as were likewise living vulgarisms were not peculiar to Africa,

[1] Cf. Gröber in *Archiv*, I. pp. 204 ff. *Vulgär-lateinische Substrate romanischer Wörter.*

[2] Cf. *Mélanges Renier*, pp. 51 ff. (on Commodianus).

[3] Cf. e.g. Cic. *de orat.* III. 11. 42: "rustica vox et agrestis quosdam delectat, quo magis antiquitatem, si ita sonet, eorum sermo retinere videatur" (*rusticitas* here is practically synonymous with *antiquitas*). Cf. *Brut.* 36. 137: "sono quasi subrustico persequebantur atque imitabantur antiquitatem."

but formed part of the popular speech wherever Latin was spoken. For vulgarism is not provincialism, and it is precisely the distinction between the two which has to a large extent been ignored by the champions of *Africitas*. The *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius, for example, abounds in vulgarisms; nevertheless Kretschmann[1] finds in Apuleius no trace of provincialism.

There are two chief characteristics of vulgar Latin all over the Empire: the weakening of organic forms and general decay of grammar (leading to the substitution of analytic for synthetic usages), and the breaking down of the barriers between verse and prose. Under one or other of these headings most of the vulgarisms which are claimed as Africanisms can be classified[2], and it will be seen that in almost every case parallels may be cited from non-African authors.

[1] Cf. Kretschmann, *De Latinitate L. Apulei Madaurensis*, Königsberg, 1865, p. 33: "neque enim in verbis aut locutionibus aut denique structura invenimus aliquid quod possimus certis argumentis nixi ad provincialem linguae consuetudinem quandam revocare." Cf. Koziol, *Der Stil des Apuleius*, Vienna, 1872. The popular element is far more striking in the *Metamorphoses* than in the *Apologia* or *Florida*. Cf. H. Becker, *Studia Apuleiana*, Berlin, 1879, for differences in the use of particles and in vocabulary generally.

[2] The list of Africanisms appended below is by no means exhaustive, but it includes the most important of the examples given by champions of the dialect theory, and those which at first sight seem best to substantiate their position.

A. I. THE WEAKENING OF ORGANIC FORMS AND THE GENERAL DECAY OF GRAMMAR.

This appears in various forms:

(i) *The disappearance of the distinction between the degrees of comparison.*

This is said to be due to Semitic influence (since Punic has no comparative and superlative), and to the African love for "barocke Inconcinnität." It is found in the following usages:

1. *The juxtaposition of positive and superlative.*

e.g. Fr. 39, bone et optime.
Arnob. III. 11, aegre atque aegerrime. Cf. *ib.* I. 22, I. 3, etc.
Ap. *Met.* VII. 20, pigrum tardissimumque.
Cyp. 313. 26[1], summa et perpetua.
Vict. Vit. 1. 24, nobilissimam atque famosam.
Cf. inscr. 3109, cara atque dulcissima, 8270, 8559, *E.* 628, etc.

But this collocation is found in Latin of all periods, and in Greek.

Cf. Plaut. *Rud.* 1321, miserum istuc verbum et pessumum.
Ter. *Phorm.* 226, iustam...facilem, vincibilem, optumam.
Cic. *de nat. Deor.* III. 27, recte et verissime.
Cic. *Ep. ad Fam.* XI. 19. 2, seditiosum et incertissimum.

[1] Cf. Watson, *op. cit.* p. 216: "Cyprian is very moderate in the combination of different degrees of comparison."

Vitruv. I. 6. 2[1], parvo brevissimoque. Cf. *ib.* IV. 1. 1.

Vell. Pat. II. 69, acri atque prosperrimo bello.

Ennod. *Carm.* 1. 9, p. 531, sancti ac beatissimi.

Cf. also Tac. *Hist.* III. 17, ubi plurimus labor, unde aliqua spes.

And in Greek:

Cf. Thuc. I. 84. 1, ἐλευθέραν καὶ εὐδοξοτάτην πόλιν.
Xen. *Hell.* V. 3. 17, εὐτάκτους δὲ καὶ εὐοπλοτάτους.

2. *The juxtaposition of positive and comparative.*

e.g. Ap. *Met.* X. 16, gratiosum commendatioremque.
Arnob. I. 32, plebeia atque humiliora.
Cyp. 191. 11, meliora et divina.
Lact. *Inst.* VII. 12. 23, extremi ac tenuiores.
But cf. Ennod. 420. 16, seniora et vetusta.

3. *The Comparative with magis.*

e.g. Ap. *Met.* XI. 10, magis aptior.
ib. IX. 36, magis irritatiores.
Arnob. I. 29, magis rectius.
Cyp. 397. 10, magis utilius.
Vict. Vit. 11. 2, magis laudabilior.
But cf. Plaut. *Amph.* 301, magis maiorem.
ib. Aul. 422, mollior magis.
Ter. *Hec.* 738, magis cautius.
Colum. VIII. 5. 5, magis utiliores.

Cf. also the comparative with *maxime*: Vitruv. I. 1. 4, maxime facilius. Cf. *magis* with superlative: Tert. *Apol.*

[1] Cf. Praun, *Syntax des Vitruvs*, p. 71 and *Archiv* VIII. p. 178.

23, magis proxima; Tert. *de idol.* 11, magis proximum, etc.

4. *The Superlative with* tam, perquam, *etc.*

e.g. Ap. *Met.* II. 7, perquam sapidissimum.
Vit. Fulg. 30, tam maxima.
Inscr. *E.* 766, in tam splendidissima civitate.
Cf. also Arnob. II. 11, levissimum multo est.
But cf. *C. I. L.* IX. 1724 (Beneventum), parentes perquam infelicissimi.

5. *Irregular forms of comparison.*

e.g. Ap. *de deo Socr.* 3, postremius.
Ap. *apol.* 98, postremissimus. Cf. Tert. *de cult. fem.* II. 1.
Arnob. V. 7, minimissimus.
Tert. *Apol.* 19, extremissimus.
But cf. C. Gracchus, *ap.* Gell. XV. 12. 3, omnium nationum postremissimum.
Sen. *Ep.* 108. 16, proximior.
Lat. Anthol. V. 119, multo sum parvulo parvus.
ib. 172, nulla mihi velox avis inventu volatu.
C. I. L. IX. 1876 (Beneventum), plusquam benignissimus.
ib. 2878 (Histonium), integrissimus.
ib. IX. 3729 (Marsi Marruvium), miserissimus.

Cf. X. 30, X. 8160, II. 1085. Many similar "Africanisms" occur in Elizabethan English. Some prepositional usages, e.g. Fr. 95, "nihil prae vobis dulcius," are due to the influence of Biblical translations. Cf. Tert. *Scorp.* 1, where "dulcia super mella" is a translation of the Septuagint

version of Psalm xix. 10, γλυκύτερα ὑπὲρ μέλι, itself a literal translation from the Hebrew. Such usages are due, therefore, not to direct, but to indirect, Semitic influence, through translation.

(ii) *The loose use of the diminutive.*

e.g. M. A. *ap.* Fr. 35, plusculus.
ib. 97, longiusculam.
ib. 157, argentiolae.
ib. 137, formicularum...apicularum.
Gell. IX. 14. 6, plusculus. (But cf. Plaut. *Rud.* 131, Ter. *Hec.* 177.)
Ap. *Met.* II. 7, ipsa linea tunica mundule amicta et russea fasciola praenitente altiuscule sub ipsas papillas succinctula illud cibarium vasculum floridis palmulis rotabat in circulum, etc.

This extended use of the diminutive is due in part to the archaistic revival, the use of diminutives being a feature of old Latin poetry, and especially of that of Ennius and Plautus; and partly to the influence of rhetoric[1]. But the usage is also characteristic of all vulgar Latin[2].

Cf. Plaut. *Rud.* 416, adolescentula. Cf. Ter. *And.* 118.
Plaut. *Pseud.* 503, diecula. Cf. Ter. *And.* 710, Cic. *ad Att.* v. 21. 13.
Plaut. *Amph.* prol. 143, pinnula. Cf. Col. VIII. 5. 5.

[1] Cf. Kretschmann, *op. cit.* pp. 65 ff.

[2] On diminutives as a feature of spoken Latin, cf. Prof. Minton Warren on "The contribution of Latin inscriptions to the study of Latin language and literature," in *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* Vol. 36, 1893, pp. 16 ff. Cf. also P. Wahrmann, *op. cit.* pp. 83 ff. Diminutives are much rarer in the more "classical" Terence than in Plautus.

Cic. *de Nat. Deor.* III. 17, in illa aureola oratiuncula.

Hadrian (to his soul):

animula, vagula, blandula,
hospes comesque corporis,
quae nunc abibis in loca?
pallidula, rigida, nudula;
nec ut soles, dabis iocos.

Petron.[1], *pass.* e.g. 63, valde audaculus,
38, meliusculus,

and the fragments of Varro's Satires[2].

Of the sixteen new diminutive formations given by Kübler as occurring on African inscriptions, four are found in non-African authors,

viz. nepticula, 2604. Cf. Symm. VI. 32.
rusticulus, *E.* 279. Cf. Cic. *Sest.* 82.
solaciolum, 7427. Cf. Catull. 2. 7.
statiuncula, *E.* 756. Cf. Petron. 50 (statuncula).

Cf. inscriptions *passim*,

e.g. *C. I. L.* IV. (Pompeii), 4447, fonticulus.
5025, nummulum.
576, foruncula, etc.

(iii) *Confusion of Genders.*

This is said to be peculiarly common on African inscriptions, e.g. 15597, cui artificius et ingenius exsuperavit, etc. Cf. Arnob. III. 9, caelos.

But for caelos, masc., cf. Lucr. II. 1097, Petron. 39. Cf. also Petron.[3] 41, vinus; 71, unum lactem; 46, libra

[1] Cf. E. Ludwig, *de Petronii sermone plebeio*, Marburg, 1869, pp. 28 f.
[2] Cf. Index to Bücheler's edition of Petronius, etc., p. 248.
[3] Cf. Ludwig, *op. cit.* pp. 23 ff. and Bücheler's index, p. 132.

(for libros); and for confusion of genders in non-African inscriptions, cf. *C. I. L.* indices *pass.*

e.g. x. 2496, dolor relictum. Cf. *ib.* 563, 2487, etc.
v. 5418, hunc castrum. Cf. 4923, etc. (Gall. Cis.).
ix. 259, tabulum incisum. Cf. 3473, 3971, etc.
iv. 3129, cadaver mortuus. Cf. 6641, etc. (Pompeii).
xiv. 4190, donus. Cf. 166, 472, 1868, etc. (Latium).

(iv) *Confusion of Cases.*

e.g. Ap. *met.* vii. 21, prae cetera flagitia[1].
Vict. Vit.[2] 2. 58, ad pecore.
ib. ii. 86, pro totum.

Except for inscriptions, this is found for the most part only in the later Africans[3], and in the case of omission or addition of final *-m*, it may be due to the scribe.

Cf. also Petron. 46, prae literas.
Ennod. 129. 23, una hora habens.

It occurs in inscriptions in all parts of the Empire.

Cf. Orelli, 4659, cum quem (Rome), etc.

For Gallic inscriptions, cf. Ed. le Blaut, *Nouveau recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule*, p. 370, ad honore beati; p. 446, pro luminaria sanctorum; p. 13, inter sanctis, etc.

Cf. *C. I. L.* xii. (Gall. Narb.)
2819, ob pietatis causa.
1185, pro se et suos.

[1] Sic codd.; *praeter* em. Van der Vliet; *prae cetero flagitio* Hildebrand.

[2] For the language of Victor of Vita, cf. F. Ferrère, "Langue et style de Victor de Vita" in *Rev. de Phil.* 25, 1901, pp. 110 ff. and pp. 320 ff.

[3] Cf. Boissier on Commodianus, *Mélanges Renier*, p. 57.

v. (Gall. Cis.) 1592, de donum.
4945, pro suos.
7404, cum coniugem suam.
xiv. (Latium), 1473, 1143, 3898, 5898, etc.

Cf. esp. 39, per sacerdotes Valerio Pancarpo, 158, 431. iii. 642, etc.; ii. (Spain) 177, 497, 736, etc.; ix. 795, 4215, 1938, etc.; iv. (Pompeii) 221, 5375, 4603.

Case-confusion is often due to

(v) *Confusion of the ideas of rest and motion.*

e.g. Tert. *Scorp.* 3, tradidit in manibus (in *manus*, Hild.).
ib. Apol. 40, Christianos esse in causam.
Arnob. i. 19, in aliis irasci (one MS. has *alios*).
Cf. inscr. 943, in pacem; 1767, in hoc signum.
Cf. *ubi* = *quo*, e.g. Ap. *Met.* ix. 39, ubi ducis asinum.
quo = *ubi*, *ib.* iv. 3, stabulum quo deverteramus.
Cf. *ib.* v. 7.

But this confusion is a feature of all vulgar Latin.

Cf. Petron. 15, in controversiam esse.
ib. 42, fui in funus.
ib. 58, videbo te in publicum.
Cf. *ib.* 19, 26, etc.
Cf. also *C. I. L.* iv. (Pompeii) 2246, redei domo, etc.

(vi) *Confusion of Number.*

e.g. Cyp. 443. 2, 446. 3.
Ap. *Met.* i. 1, iii. 2, etc.

But cf. inscriptions *passim*, e.g. v. (Gall. Cis.) 895, astante civibus.

Cf. also Cic. *Cat.* 1. 9, video...mea voce...nobis.
Ep. ad Fam. v. 12. 1, ardeo...ut nomen nostrum.

Cf. the vulgar-archaic use of *praesente, absente* with the plural[1]:

e.g. Plaut. *Bacch.* 142, praesente ibus.
Ter. *Eun.* 649, absente nobis, etc.
Cf. Ennod. 169. 24, 244. 2, etc.

(vii) *Confusion of Tenses*[2].

(1) *Perfect, for present, infinitive.*

e.g. Tert. *Marc.* III. 7, praecessisse debuerat.
ib. IV. 1, debueras...determinasse, etc.
Cf. inscr. *E.* 279, vidi crevisse nepotes.
The use is simply a vulgarism.

Cf. Vitruv. VI. 1. 4, et ea quae non potest esse probata sine letteratura.

Cf. *ib.* VIII. 1. 3 (nata esse = nasci); Ennod. 234. 5, debuit suscepisse[3]; *ib.* 365. 5, etc.

(2) *Pluperfect, for imperfect, subjunctive*[4].

e.g. Ap. *Met.* VII. 28, donec confoedassem.
ib. Apol. 44, vellem hercle adesset...in te invertisset.

Cf. *ib.* 61, Arnob. II. 37, Vict. Vit. 1. 20, etc., Dracont. VII. 4 and 18.

According to Hoppe and Gölzer it does not occur in Tertullian. But cf. *de Pallio* 1, ut Scipionem...salutasset (= salutaret). It occurs also in non-Africans: e.g. *Bell. Hisp.* 3 (fuissent = essent) and 22.

[1] Cf. Dräger, *op. cit.* II. p. 818.

[2] Cf. Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata*, p. 431, and Dräger, *op. cit.* I. pp. 254 ff., II. pp. 404 f.

[3] Cf. pres. inf. for future, e.g. Ennod. 77. 16, evenire beneficia non ambigo; cf. 49. 24, 50. 16.

[4] Cf. plup. for perf. indic. in Ap. *Apol.* 93: de quo supra dixeram.

Salv. *Gub. Dei*, VI. 75 (instaurasset).

Ennod. 57. 11, ante enim quid debuissem consideravi quam quid velles agnoscerem.

According to Kübler it is found only on one very late African inscription, viz. 684 *b*, vereretur quis...fuisset.

Cf. also Gallic inscriptions: e.g. Le Blaut, *op. cit.* p. 163, petivit ut fidelis de saeculo recessisset (= recederet). Indeed the French imperfects in *-asse*, *-isse*, derived from Latin pluperfect forms, suggest that the use of the pluperfect for imperfect subjunctive must have been common in Gaul.

(viii) *Confusion of Voices*[1].

(1) *Deponents used as passives.*

e.g. tutor, Fr. 215. But cf. Plaut. *Amph.* 651, *Merc.* 865.

remunerari, Min. Fel. 7. 2, Tert. *Apol.* 46, etc.

But cf. Plin. *Ep.* VII. 31. 7.

adipisci, Gell. XVIII. 16. 8. Cf. inscr. 2581, adepto consulatu.

(2) *Deponents in the active form.*

e.g. mutuare, Tert. *Valent.* 10. But cf. Plin. *N. H.* II. 6. 9, § 45.

merere, Min. Fel. 6. 1, 9. 4.

But cf. exhortare, Petron. 76.

criminare, Plaut. *Pseud.* 493.

amplexare, Petron. 63.

arbitrare, Cic. *de nat. Deor.* II. 29 (arbitrato).

praedare, Plaut. *Rud.* 1241.

[1] Cf. Rönsch, *op. cit.* p. 297 ff., Dräg. *op. cit.* I. pp. 155 ff., and W. Heraeus, "Die Sprache des Petronius und die Glossen," Lpzg, 1899, pp. 38 ff.

(3) *Active verbs in deponent forms*[1].

e.g. murmurari, Ap. *Flor.* 16 (p. 170).
paeniteri, Tert. *Paen.* IV. inc., Vulg. Marc. i. 15.
transmigrari, Fulg. *Myth.* 3. 10.
But cf. rideri, Petron. 57.
somniri, *ib.* 74.
puderi, *ib.* 47.
bellari, Verg. *Aen.* XI. 660.
comperiri, Ter. *And.* 902, Tac. *Ann.* IV. 20.

For irregular deponent forms in non-African inscriptions, cf. *C. I. L.* X. 2496. 17, dubitari; *ib.* 4494, meremur (= maeremus).

(ix) *Confusion of Mood.*

This is especially common in the use of the indicative in indirect speech.

e.g. Ap. *Met.* I. 25, faxo scias quem ad modum...mali debent coherceri.

Cf. *ib.* II. 22, VI. 5, etc.; *Flor.* 14.

Dracont. X. 46, ut nossent quid puppis erat. Cf. *ib.* V. 86, VII. 4, etc.

But it is not peculiar to the African writers.

Vitruv. II. 6. 4, 8. 18, 9. 17, IV. 2. 1, VII. 5. 4.

And note especially subjunctive and indicative in the same clause,

e.g. *ib.* VI. 1. 3, cogunt...erudissent.
IX. 7. 7, quae nobis tradita sunt et a quibus sint inventa dicam.

[1] Cf. Gell. XVIII. 12.

It is found also in Livy; Riemann[1] quotes eight instances, e.g. III. 71. 7, agrum de quo *ambigitur* finium Coriolanorum fuisse. Cf. XXIV. 25. 3, XXV. 4. 6, etc.

It is even found occasionally in Caesar, although most of the instances rest on doubtful MS. authority; cf. however *B. Gall.* I. 40. 5, factum eius hostis periculum patrum nostrorum memoria, cum...non minorem laudem exercitus quam ipse imperator meritus *videbatur*. The usage is simply a vulgarism, which, as the feeling for the niceties of grammatical expression grew less acute, crept gradually more and more into literary Latin, but is in no way peculiarly "African."

A. II. THE SIMPLIFICATION OF DECLENSIONS, PARADIGMS, ETC., AND THE GRADUAL SUBSTITUTION OF ANALYTIC FOR SYNTHETIC USAGES.

(i) *Periphrastic tenses and the use of auxiliaries.*

Periphrastic tenses with the future participle[2], and *habere* as an auxiliary with such words as *exploratum, statutum, cognitum*[3], etc., are found throughout early and classical Latin; there are also rare instances of the auxiliary use of *velle*:

e.g. *S.Ctum de Bacch.*, nei quis eorum Bacanal habuisse velet.

Plaut. *Most.* 666, ego ire in Piraeum volo.

But the earliest instance of *velle* as a future auxiliary is cited by E. W. Watson[4] from Cyp. 481. 1, "addiderunt (martyres) non in hoc fidere ut liberari praesentia vellent,

[1] Cf. O. Riemann, *La langue et la grammaire de Tite-Live*, Paris, 1885, p. 290. Cf. Dräger, *op. cit.* pp. 442, 443.

[2] Cf. Dräger, *op. cit.* I. pp. 288 ff. [3] *ib.* I. pp. 294 f.

[4] E. W. Watson, *op. cit.* p. 189, note.

sed illam libertatis et securitatis aeternae gloriam cogitarent."

The periphrastic use of *esse* with *the present participle*, which is sometimes claimed as an Africanism on the ground of its frequent appearance in the Vulgate and in the Scriptural quotations in Tertullian, was probably common in the vulgar speech.

Cf. Ap. *Met.* VII. 19, moras non sustinens est.
Arnob. III. 38, Cyp. 705. 3, 653. 9, etc.
Tert. *Scorp.* 13 (Rom. viii. 18), Vulg. Luc. xvii. 35 (erunt molentes in unum), etc.
But cf. Plaut. *Poen.* 1038, ut sis sciens.
Liv. v. 34. 6, continens sit (= contineat).
Bell. Hisp. 29, currens erat.

(ii) *The Positive with an adverb for the Superlative.*

This is claimed by Monceaux as an Africanism which shows Semitic influence, since Punic has no superlative[1]. But the superlative is as common in African Latin as anywhere else[2]; indeed Monceaux himself adduces the extensive use of the superlative in proof of the existence of a pleonastic and exaggerated African style.

For the use of *longe, valde, egregie*[3], etc., with the positive, cf. Ap. *Met.* I. 21, longe opitulentus, etc.

[1] Monceaux is hardly consistent here, for in speaking of the use of the ablative of an abstract for an adverb (*diligentia, misericordia*, etc., *vid. inf.*) he calls this Semitic, on the ground that Semitic languages have no adverbs. In view of this it seems strange to ascribe an *adverbial* construction to Semitic influence. The Semitic languages form their comparative by a preposition. Cf. *dulcia super mella, sup.* pp. 188, 189.

[2] Cf. Ap. *Met. pass.*; especially the story of *Cupid and Psyche*.

[3] Monceaux adds *horribiliter*, from Fr. 29; but, as Boissier pointed out, *horribiliter* is used in this passage with a verb, *scripsisti*, and not with an adjective at all; and it occurs in a letter from Marcus Aurelius, who was certainly not Punic.

But cf. Caes. *B.G.* II. 29. 2, oppidum egregie munitum.
Enn. *ap.* Cic. *Rep.* I. 18, egregie cordatus homo.
Stat. *Theb.* X. 140, longe gravis.
Cic. *Rep.* I. 37. 58, aetas valde longa.
ib. ad Fam. XV. 17. 3, exspectatio valde magna.

There is nothing "Semitic" here; and further, *valde magna, valde bella*, etc., are slightly different in meaning from *maxima, pulcherrima*, etc.

(iii) *The use of prepositions to convey meanings expressed in Classical Latin by the simple case.*

This use is both archaic and vulgar, for prepositions were employed more extensively in early Latin than in the classical period (cf. Plaut. *Amph.* 149, Ter. *And.* 35), and naturally continued to be used in ordinary speech, as Augustus used them, for greater clearness. (Cf. Suet. *Aug.* 86, "praecipuamque curam duxit sensum animi quam apertissime exprimere. quod quo facilius efficeret... neque praepositiones urbibus addere neque coniunctiones saepius iterare dubitavit.")

Cf. (1) a *and ablative = ablative of comparison*[1].
e.g. Cyp. *Ep.* 835. 4, a centesimo praemio minor.
Cael. Aur. *acut.* 1. 56, plus a cetero corpore.
Cf. *ib.* 3. 109.

This is a pure vulgarism, though according to Sergius it must have occurred in some classical writer. Cf. Keil, *Gram. Lat.* IV. p. 492: "dicimus enim 'fortior ab illo' et 'fortior illo.' sed illud, quamvis et rationem et auctoritatem habeat, in usu tamen non est."

[1] Cf. also the doubtful passage in Vitruv. VI. 3. 5, "non enim atria minora ab maioribus easdem possunt habere symmetriarum rationes."

(2) e *and ablative = instrumental ablative*[1].

Cf. ex summo studio, cf. Ap. *Met.* VIII. 5, IX. 15, Flor. I. 3 (I. 9. 4)[2].
ex summis opibus, cf. Fr. 42, 97, 228.
ex summa spe, cf. Gell. VI. 3. 47.
ex summis viribus, cf. Ap. *Met.* II. 32[3].
Cf. ex aequali modo, Cass. Fel. 11. 1, 54. 12, etc.

These are vulgar-archaic colloquialisms taken from the old Latin authors.

Cf. Plaut. *Mil. Glor.* 620[4], ex opibus summis.
Cf. Enn. Frag. 89 R.

Classical prose writers generally use the simple ablative; but cf. Sall. *Cat.* 51. 38, cum summo studio; Corn. Nep. XIV. 2. 1, qua ex re; Cic. *Rep.* II. 33. 58, ex aere alieno commota civitas.

Cf. also Symm. *Ep.* IV. 60, VII. 128. 1, ex summis opibus.

(3) de *and ablative = genitive.*

e.g. Tert. *Apol.* 5, portio Neronis de crudelitate.
M. A. *ap.* Fr. 67, pelliculum de hostia.

[1] Sittl (*Jahresb.* 1891, p. 246) revoked his opinion that this was a Punism: "was ich dagegen für Punismen erklärte (*Lok. Versch.* pp. 92 ff.) muss und kann alles auf andere Weise erklärt werden."

[2] On Florus cf. Wölfflin ("Die ersten Spuren des Afrikanischen Lateins") in *Archiv* VI. pp. 1 ff. Cf. *ib.* p. 5, "Bei Florus ist an plautinische Reminiscenzen nicht zu denken." But there is no reason to suppose that Florus had not read Plautus. *ex* is read in this passage by two MSS. Rossbach, however, omits it in the 1896 Teubner text.

[3] Though cf. *Met.* VI. 10, VII. 24, where Apuleius uses the simple ablative.

[4] Though cf. *Most.* 348 (*summis opibus*).

Pervig. Ven. 6, implicat casas virentes de flagello myrteo.

Cf. *ib.* 24, 38, 61, etc. (Bücheler).

Dracont., est tibi cura, Deus, de quidquid ubique creasti.

But this also is vulgar-archaic, and occurs occasionally in the classical authors[1].

e.g. Plaut. *Pseud.* 1164, dimidium...de praeda dare.

Cf. *Stich.* 400, *Most.* 150, Ter. *Heaut.* 652, ne expers partis esset de nostris bonis.

Cic. *de Off.* I. 43, de duobus honestis utrum honestius.

Cf. Caes. *B. G.* VI. 13, Vell. Pat. II. 82. 3, Val. Max. VII. 8. 9 (unum *ex* assidentibus).

Tac. *Ann.* VI. 25, nihil de saevitia remittebatur.

Eutrop. III. 10, magna pars de exercitu.

Reposianus[2] *de concubitu Martis et Veneris*, 30, de roseis connecte manus, Vulcane, catenis.

This use of *de* is obviously not an African invention; further, the approximation of *de* in the Dracontius passage to the French *de* shows that the use could not have been peculiar to the Latin of Africa, which left no Romance language to survive it.

(4) de *and ablative = instrumental ablative*[3].

This also is a late Latin vulgarism.

e.g. Ap. *Met.* III. 8, de vindicta solatium date.

ib. VIII. 8, Thrasyllus de ipso nomine temerarius.

[1] Cf. Dräger, *op. cit.* I. pp. 459, 628.

[2] According to Bährens Reposianus was a contemporary of Dracontius. Boissier (*J. des Sav.* 1892, April) cites in comparison with this construction the Vergilian "templum de marmore ponam," from Sallust's letter of Catiline "ex conscientia de culpa," and from an inscription in the Forum "margaritarius de via sacra."

[3] Cf. Sittl, *Lok. Versch.* p. 127.

B. The breaking down of the barrier between verse and prose.

So far we have dealt with the decay of grammar and the loss of the feeling for the distinction between various organic forms; the so-called Africanisms which fall under our second head, *the breaking down of the barrier between verse and prose*, are to be attributed to a similar loss of the feeling for the natural distinction between the prosaic and the poetical style and vocabulary, upon which Quintilian was the last to insist[1]. The poetical element is especially strong in Apuleius[2], but it is in no sense peculiar to the African school[3]. A few of the poetical usages claimed as Africanisms are:

(i) *populi.*

e.g. Ap. *Met.* XI. 13, populi mirantur, cf. *ib.* XI. 16.
Gell. III. 13. 2, cum compluris populos concurrentes videret, etc.

But this is probably a hexameter-verse form which has crept into prose.

Cf. Ovid, *Met.* VII. 523, dira lues ira populis Iunonis iniquae incidit.
ib. VIII. 298, diffugiunt populi.

Cf. also Ennod. 381. 10, stabant attoniti populi.

[1] Cf. Quint. I. 6. 2, VIII. 3. 60, and 6. 17. Cf. also Tac. *Dial.* 20 and Fr. 54. It is the absence or strict limitation of the poetical influence which differentiates Quintilian so decisively from other Silver Latin prose writers. This natural distinction between verse and prose has perhaps been somewhat exaggerated. *Vid. sup.* p. 123.

[2] Cf. Kretschmann, *op. cit.* pp. 17—20, Koziol, *op. cit.* p. 309; cf. also Zink, *Der Mytholog Fulgentius*, Würzburg, 1867, pp. 49—55.

[3] Cf. especially Vergilianisms in Tacitus. The poetical element in later Latin prose may be due in part to the influence of the schools, where Vergil was learnt extensively by heart (cf. Homerisms in late Greek).

(ii) longe longeque *with a comparative.*

e.g. Fr. 143, l. l. praeferre.
Gell. XIII. 29. 3, l. l. amplius.
Ap. *Met.* XI. 3, l. l. confutare.
Flor. I. 45. 4, l. l. cruentior, etc.

But cf. Ovid, *Met.* IV. 325, sed longe cunctis longeque beatior illa.

It occurs once in Cicero with the superlative:

de Fin. II. 21. 68, longe longeque plurimum tribuere honestati.

(iii) *The free apposition of substantives in place of a substantive with an attribute.*

Cf. Tert. *adv. Marc.* 1. 29, virgo caro.
Arnob. II. 17, ministras manus, etc.

But this usage, which is common in poetry, is found also in classical prose with certain words, and was merely extended in later Latin:

e.g. Cicero uses *artifex, gladiator, tiro,* etc., as adjectives; Livy *advena, domitor, transfuga,* and Curtius *advena, domitor, virgo, victor,* etc.

C. A number of so-called Africanisms fall under our third head, *Graecism,* though here again those which are to be attributed to the influence of rhetoric and the Greek sophistic will be dealt with more conveniently in the next section. Graecisms were by no means peculiar to Africa; the vocabulary and syntax of Petronius, for example, show clear signs of Greek influence. Nor was Greek unopposed in Africa. In fact the need in Africa for a Latin translation of the Bible, as evidenced by the existence of the Itala and the Vulgate, suggests that Greek was mainly confined to the

educated classes. The Graecisms of some of the later African authors may be due, like their archaisms, to imitation of Apuleius[1] and his *fabula graecanica*, or still more often of Tertullian, who in his struggle to express the doctrines of Christianity for the first time in the Latin tongue was inevitably strongly influenced by Greek. As to the spread of Greek among the masses, expert opinion is divided. Boissier[2] thinks that the language was already well known there in the second century A.D., but Gölzer[3] holds with apparent reason that Graecisms are not a characteristic trait of African Latin until the latter half of the third century A.D., and that while Apuleius and Tertullian knew Greek well, this knowledge was personal to them and (save for a certain number of words introduced by traders and soldiers) was not shared by the bulk of the population. The very fact that Tertullian, who seems to have known both languages equally well[4], abandoned Greek in

[1] Kretschmann, *op. cit.* p. 67, holds that the Greek element in Apuleius is not very great in the *Metamorphoses*, or even in the other works. Cf. *Apol.* 39, "res paucissimis cognitas Graece Latine propriis et elegantibus vocabulis conscribo"; and *ib.* 38, "in quibus (sc. scriptis meis) animadvertes cum res cognitu raras tum nomina etiam Romanis inusitata et in hodiernum, quod sciam, infecta, ea tamen nomina labore meo et studio ita de Graecis provenire ut tamen latina moneta percussa sint." Contrast this with Tert. *adv. Valent.* 6; on the other hand cf. *Apol.* 98; v. *ib.* 82, 83 (Greek letters to Pudentilla, his wife).

[2] Boissier, *Rom. Af.* p. 263. It has been urged that the number of Greek words used by the Christian preachers points to the wide diffusion of Greek among the common people. But it was inevitable that the language of theology should be deeply tinged with Greek, and nothing is thereby proved as to the spread among the masses of Hellenism in general, apart from the Christian vocabulary.

[3] H. Gölzer, review of H. Hoppe's "Syntax und Stil des Tertullian," in *J. des Sav.* XXVI. 2, 1907.

[4] Cf. *adv. Prax.* 3, "Latini...Graeci. At ego, si quid utriusque linguae praecerpsi...."

favour of Latin[1], suggests that the latter was more widely understood. According to Gölzer's view Hellenisms in Tertullian and Apuleius are either such as were adopted in all countries where Latin was spoken and written, or such as were due to the influence of education and wide reading upon the personal styles of these authors.

Greek inscriptions at Carthage are relatively few, and elsewhere are found chiefly in the coast towns, such as Leptis and Caesarea[2].

A few so-called Hellenisms are really archaistic, while others which have been claimed as "African" are by no means peculiar to Africa, as the following examples will show[3].

(1) *The omission of* magis *or* potius *before comparative* quam.

e.g. Cyp. 573. 6, ut pacem non adpeterent quam vindicarent.

Fr. 75, iudicem se quam oratorem vult laudari (Eussner reads *mavult*).

This is only found on one African inscription, 2756; ut eius spiritus vi extorqueretur quam naturae redderetur.

Cf. also Tac. *Hist.* III. 60, and 70; IV. 76, etc., and Ammian. XXVI. 4. 1.

[1] All Tertullian's extant work is in Latin; but cf. *de Virg. vel.* 1, inc. "Latine *quoque* ostendam virgines nostras velari oportere"; *de coron.* 6, "sed et huic materiae...graeco quoque stilo satisfecimus"; *de baptism.* 15, "sed de isto plenius iam nobis in graeco digestum est." For the anti-Greek spirit of Fronto and Cyprian, *vid. sup.* pp. 32 ff.

[2] Cf. Monceaux, *L'Af. Chrét.* I. p. 51, notes 2 and 3. The *tabellae devotionis* or *exsecrationis* at Carthage (*C. I. L.* VIII. *suppl.* 12504—12511) are written in either language indiscriminately.

[3] e.g. *incoram omnium* (Ap. *Met.* VII. 21); *tantus ingenii*, etc. The early Latin authors, being nearer to the Greek originals, are naturally more Hellenistic.

(2) *The genitive of the personal or reflective pronoun.*

e.g. Ap. *Met.* III. 13, mei causa.
Flor. II. 1. 5, misera republica in exitium sui merces erat.
Cyp. 24. 13, cultus sui, etc.
But cf. Ennod. 378. 26, contristatus est de praesentia tui.

(3) quod (= ὅτι) *with subjunctive in place of accusative and infinitive.*

e.g. Cyp. 188. 12, considerantes pariter ac scientes quod.... Cf. *ib.* 460. 15, etc.
Ap. *Met.* X. 24, nuntiaret quod....
ib. VI. 23, scitis quod sit....
Tert. *adv. Jud.* 3, dicens quod....
But cf. Plaut. *Asin.* 52, scio quod amet; *bell. Hisp.* 36 (renuntiare); Verg. *Aen.* IX. 288 (testis); Val. Max. IV. 9 (taceo); Plin. *Ep.* II. 11. 6 (adnotatum); note especially Petron. 45 (subolfacio quod), 46 (dixi quod) and 71 (scis quod), etc.

(4) *ipse* = *idem*, αὐτός[1].

e.g. Tert. *resurr.* 1, ipsos quoque defunctos exurit.
Aug. *Civ. Dei*, V. 21, ipse etiam regnum dedit.
Vict. Vit. 1. 19, ipso...tempore, cf. *ib.* 1. 43.
But cf. Manilius, 1. 698[2],
Claud. *Epigr.* 2,
and the Gallic authors, Venant. Fort. 1. 1. 26; Salv. *Gub. Dei*, IV. 11: Boeth. *comm.* I. p. 109. 15; Ennod. 314. 17,

[1] Cf. Sittl, *Lok. Versch.* p. 115. According to Rönsch, *op. cit.* p. 424, this is due to Biblical versions in which *id ipsum* is used to translate τὸ αὐτό.

[2] On the birthplace of Manilius, *vid. sup.* p. 180.

ipse accusantes...reppulit; 489. 24, si sors ipsa sequatur in patriam; 197. 13, per ipsum callem vindictam; 234. 15, diebus ipsis, etc.

(5) *The ablatival genitive.*

With (1) *dominari*, e.g. Min. Fel. 12. 5; Tert. *Apol.* 26; Lact. *ira Dei*, 14. 3.

But cf. Boeth. *comm.* II. p. 224. 18.

(2) *longe*, e.g. Ap. *Met.* v. 9, longe parentum.

(3) *intus*, cf. ἐντός, e.g. Ap. *Met.* VIII. 29, intus aedium.

(4) *dignus*, e.g. Gell. XX. 1. 8.

But cf. Greek genitives with

(1) *desinere* (cf. παύειν), in Sil. Ital. X. 84, Hor. *Od.* II. 9. 17 (desine querelarum).

(2) *desistere*, in Verg. *Aen.* X. 441.

(3) *tenere*, in Petron. 49 (ego crudelissimae severitatis non potui me tenere).

(6) *The genitive of Comparison.*

e.g. Ap. *Met.* III. 11, mei maioribus. (Van der Vliet emends to "meritisque maioribus").

ib. VIII. 27, sui meliores, cf. *ib.* X. 39, XI. 30.

Tert. *Apol.* 40, maiorem Asiae atque Africae.

But cf. Vitruv. v. 1. 3, superiora inferiorum fieri contractiora.

Tac. *Ann.* IV. 63, cui minor quadringentorum milium res.

Suet. *Oct.* 28, maiores annorum.

Symm. *Ep.* XI. 52.

Ammian. XVI. 12.

(7) *The borrowing of particles from Greek.*

Cf. Tert. *Pud.* II., *ut quid* mihi eos qui foris sunt iudicare (= *ἵνα τί*).

Cf. Vict. Vit. 3. 16.

Cf. also *utrum* (= *πότερα*) in a simple question.

So *at* = *ἀλλά*, in a concessive sentence, e.g. Ap. *Apol.* 46, quodsi hic nescit...at tu cede hinc.

Cf. *vero*, similarly, in Fulg. *Myth.* 3. 10, etc.

Some of these probably arise from literal translations from Biblical Greek (cf. compounds of *in-* privative, *inf.*).

Cf. also Cic. *de orat.* III. 13 (*neque vero*); Livy, IX. 1. 8 si...at); *ib.* I. 28. 9 (quoniam...at); cf. *ib.* I. 41. 4, III. 17. 3, etc.; Col. II. 2. 7, III. 11. 1, etc.[1]

(8) *Substantives compounded with* in- *privative* (= *ἀ-*).

e.g. Tert. *res. Carn.* 51 (trans. of 1 Cor. xv. 10), incorruptio = *ἀφθαρσία*.

These are mainly literal translations from the Septuagint version.

(9) *Names ending in* -ica, -icus (*-ικη*, *-ικος*).

vid. inf.

(10) *Words with Greek meanings.*

e.g. audio = *ἀκούω*, e.g. Ap. *Met.* V. 16, VI. 9.

capit = *ἐνδέχεται*, used impersonally with an infinitive, e.g. Tert. *ad Nat.* II. 13.

D. Quite apart from the existence or non-existence of a local dialect in Africa, there remains the question whether

[1] For *si tamen* = *εἴ γε*, cf. Sittl, *Lok. Versch.* p. 140.

there was a distinct African *style*[1]; and it is this point which is raised by the consideration of our fourth and last sub-division, the influence of *rhetoric* upon African Latin. The so-called *tumor Africus*, which shows itself in pleonasm and extravagance of every kind, has been attributed by the champions of Africanism to the influence of the Semitic temperament and of natural surroundings upon the language[2]. Norden on the other hand sees in it "Asianism in a Latin garb," and Sittl "Apuleian rhetoric[3]." These last two views amount practically to the same thing, for of that education which captivated Africa the heart and soul was rhetoric, and since a people naturally assimilates that to which it is itself akin, it was in the form of Asianism that rhetoric developed in Africa; while, on the other hand, since it

[1] Cf. Kaulen, *Handbuch der Vulgata*, p. 4, "Was man ofter Africanismus der Latinität genannt hat, ist einfach der Charakter des Vulgärlateins und kann als solcher mit gleichem Recht Gallicismus, Pannonismus, oder Italicismus heissen. In Wirklichkeit hat man unter afrikanischer Latinität *eine Stilgattung* zu verstehen, deren Eigenthümlichkeit durch den Charakter ihrer Verfasser bedingt ist."

[2] Cf. Schuchardt, *Vokal.* I. p. 98, "In dem Stil der afrikanischer Schriftstellern schimmert oft semitische Auffassungs- und Darstellungsweise durch." Cf. Am. Thierry, quoted by Boissière (*Histoire de la conquête et de l'administration romaines dans le nord de l'Afrique*, Paris, 1878, p. 383), "La langue des Romains, altérée en outre par la manie de l'archaisme, prit dans ce contact (i.e. with Punic) quelque chose d'impétueux, d'âcre et de subtil, qui contrastait avec son caractère original." He speaks of African literature as "fleur éclatante, mais un peu sauvage, éclose sous un ciel ardent, à la limite du désert." Cf. Monceaux, *op. cit.* ch. 1 (*Le génie Africain*), "Ses créations originales, comme ses bizarreries, s'expliquent par la combinaison de la culture gréco-romaine et de l'imagination orientale sous l'action toujours persistante du libre tempérament indigène et du climat." Cf. Sid. Apoll. *Ep.* VIII. 11, "urbium cives Africanarum quibus ut est regio sic mens ardentior."

[3] *Vid. sup.* p. 165.

was Apuleius who exercised most influence over subsequent authors and since it was he who gave rhetorical devices and ornaments widest scope, this *tumor Africus*, this Latin Asianism[1], becomes practically synonymous with Apuleian rhetoric. It takes various forms, of which we must examine in detail some of the most striking, noting how far they are peculiar to, or specially prevalent in, African authors.

The effects of rhetoric upon the style of the African authors are seen first in pleonasm of every kind, and secondly in certain stylistic devices and ornaments.

A. Pleonasm.

This appears in many different forms:

(i) *The juxtaposition of synonyms, with or without asyndeton.*

(1) *Of synonymous substantives, adjectives and pronouns in the same case.*

e.g.	Ap. *Met.* VII. 5,	universi omnes.
	Fr. 50,	in ceteris aliis.
	ib. 95,	forte fortuna, cf. Gell. I. 3. 30.
	ib. 122,	inter duos ambos, cf. *ib.* 183, 186[2].
	Arnob. I. 54[3],	gentes populi nationes.
	ib. II. 54,	nesciente ignaro atque inscio.

[1] Norden, *op. cit.* pp. 356 ff., maintains that between Valerius Maximus and Pliny on the one side and Florus, Apuleius and Tertullian on the other "derart hochsteigt ein grösseller oder quantitativer, kein prinzipieller oder qualitativer Unterschied." For the resemblance between Asianism and the *tumor Africus* cf. Cic. *Brut.* 13. 51 ("Asiatici oratores parum pressi et nimis redundantes").

[2] Fr. 144 *antiqui ceteri*. Bornecque unwise to *Alloci reterra*.

[3] For the juxtaposition of synonyms in Arnobius cf. Reifferscheid's index pp. 387, 482. For Apuleius cf. Kozol *op. cit.* pp. 3 ff.

But cf.

Orest. Trag. 703, furens ac irata.
Plaut. *Trin.* 1046, hominibus omnibus.
ib. 171, universum totum (so Ritschl).
Ennod. 442, 3, mundae ac non habentes maculum.

So in Greek, cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 573, ἕτεροι ἄλλοι.
cf. *ib. Orest.* 345, Dem. xv. 27.

(2) *Of synonymous verbs.*

e.g. Ap. *Met.* III. 14, prius a me concisus atque laceratus interibit ipse.
Ib. II. 58, ignoramus, nescimus.
Arnob. II. 23, ut possit discriminare, discernere, cf. *ib.* I. 11, VI. 3, II. 16, etc.

But cf. *C. I. L.* XII. 594 (Gaul), durarent permanerentque, and IX. 10 (Neretum), necesse est enim remunerari oportere, non tantum...sed verum etiam...placet tabulam ei offerre debere.

Cf. also juxtaposition of simple and compound verbs.
e.g. Fulg. *Ep.* III., ducit ac perducit.
Ap. *Met.* IX. 25, suasi ac denique persuasi.

(3) *Of synonymous particles and adverbs.*

(1) *etiam et, et...etiam.* Cyp. 677. 22, inscr. 796.

But cf. Varro *r. r.* I. 1. 2 (et...etiam); Cic. *Ep. ad Fam.* XII. 18. 1, etc.

(2) *nec non et.* Cyp. 238. 14, 318. 23, etc.

But cf. Verg. *Georg.* I. 212, II. 53; Juv. III. 204; Nemes. *Ecl.* III. 1, IV. 1; *Cyneg.* 299; Colum. VIII. 15. 6.

(3) *nec non etiam.* Gell. III. 10. 15.

But cf. Verg. *Georg.* II. 413; Suet. *de Gram.* 23.

(4) *nec non...quoque.* Cyp. 409. 14.

But cf. Petron. 72; Plin. *N. H.* XIX. 8. 41; Quint. III. 7. 18.

(5) *tam...quam etiam.* Inscr. 8924. *tametsi...tamen.* *E.* 628; Fr. 73, nisi forte tametsi paria sint, graviora tamen videntur. Cf. *ib.* 120, 188, 209. This is found in the jurists and is, according to Kalb, a vulgarism[1]. Cf. also Caes. *b. Gall.* I. 30. 2, *b. Civ.* I. 26. 2, etc.; Boeth. *cons.* 1. 3.

(6) *simul pariter.* Flor. I. 33. 1.

But cf. Plaut. *Curc.* 48, amo pariter simul.

Mart. X. 35. 17, pariter simulque.

(7) *vix et aegre.* Flor. I. 26. Cf. Ap. *Met.* I. 14, vix et aegerrime.

But cf. Val. Max. VI. 9. 14, vix atque aegre, and in Greek μόλις καὶ βραδέως.

(8) *usquequaque ubique.* Fr. 74.

(9) *statim tempore.* Gell. *pref.* 18 (Hosius, *temere*; one MS. has *tempere*).

Cf. *mox deinde*, Col. II. 1. 5; *statim deinde*, *ib.* VIII. 15. 6; *post deinde*, Ter. *And.* 483; Cic. *ad Att.* II. 23. 2; *inde iam deinceps*, Gell. XIV. 1. 20.

(10) *itidem...ita.* Fr. 95.

(11) *quod enim.* Ap. *Met.* IX. 11.

But cf. *quia enim*, Plaut. *Capt.* 884, *Mil. Glor.* 834, etc.; Petron. 31.

(12) *nequicquam frustra.* Ap. *Met.* VIII. 16.

But cf. Catull. 77. 1, Rufe, mihi frustra ac nequiquam credite amice.

[1] Cf. Kalb, *Roms Juristen*, p. 191. He protests against this being regarded as an Africanism.

Many other similar pleonasms occur, especially in Apuleius; but such pleonasms are used on occasion by the writers of all periods and of all countries, for the sake of special emphasis.

Cf. Plaut. *Curc.* 375,	verum hercle vero.
Cic. *pro Rosc.* 39. 112,	ergo idcirco.
Liv. I. 25. 2,	itaque ergo.
Col. IV. 21. 2,	nisi si admodum nimia ubertas.
Ammian. XVIII. 12. 10,	denique tandem.
Ib. XV. 5. 3,	ut quasi.

The earliest instance is cited by Sittl[1] from the Twelve Tables (*fr.* 3. 2, Bruns)—*post deinde*; and the usage lasts right on in the Romance languages.

(4) *Of a substantive with a synonym in the genitive*[2].

e.g. Arnob. II. 22,	aevitas temporis.
ib. II. 29,	formidinis horror.
Cyp. 220. 17,	concordia pacis.
ib. 721. 17,	lapsus ruinae.
Min. Fel. 28. 6,	execrationis horror.
ib. 2. 3,	avitas desiderii.
Gell. III. 10. 14,	discrimina periculorum.
Apul. *pass.*[3]	

[1] Cf. Sittl, *Lok. Versch.* p. 98, note 34; cf. Dräger, *op. cit.* I. pp. 127 f.

[2] Cf. the use of an abstract in the genitive in place of an adjective; *vid. inf.*

[3] Cf. Koziol, *op. cit.* pp. 26 f. According to Sittl this construction is not found in Fronto, Gellius or Tertullian. But cf. Gell. x. 6. 2, classis navium, *ib.* XVI. 3. 3, voluntas desiderandi.

But cf. Cic. *de Orat.* I. 10. 41, omnis sermonis disputatio.
Curt. III. 3. 3, habitus vestis.
Ennod. 375. 15, tanta multitudinis frequentia.

Cf. also Greek : ἔριδος νεῖκος, πῆμα κακοῖο, in Homer, εὐνῆς λέχος in Tragedy.

(5) *Of a substantive with the genitive of the same word* (*the* identische Genetiv).

e.g. Flor. I. 22 (II. 6. 35), urbs urbium.
ib. II. 26 (IV. 12. 13), barbari barbarorum[1].
Aug. *Conf.* III. 6. 10, vita vitarum.
ib. VIII. 11. 26, nugae nugarum et vanitates vanitatum.

Cf. Vulgate *pass.* e.g. Tim. I. 1. 17, in saecula saeculorum (εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων).

But cf. *Carmen Saliare* (*ap.* Varro VII. 7), divum deo.
Plaut. *Capt.* 825, rex regum ; cf. Cic. *Ep.* IX. 14. 2.
Hor. *Ep.* I. 1. 107, Liv. XLV. 27. 9.
Vell. Pat. I. 1. 2, Sen. *Agam.* 39.
Mart. VI. 4, princeps principum.
Sen. *Medea* 233, ducem ducum.
Petron. 37, nummi nummorum, etc.

Cf. also Greek : Aesch. *Suppl.* 503, ἄναξ ἀνάκτων and (with adjectives) Soph. *O. C.* 1238, κακὰ κακῶν.

Cf. Soph. *O. R.* 465.

It is found also in the Edda, in old German and in Lithuanian. Sittl[2] originally called it a Semitic use, and

[1] Cf. *Archiv* VIII. p. 452; and cf. Landgraf, *Act. Erlang.* 1881, II. pp. 34 ff.

[2] Cf. Sittl, *op. cit.* p. 94. But cf. W. Kroll, in *Rhein. Mus.* Vol. 52 (1897), p. 585: "Alle Beispiele die Sittl, S. 94, anführt, stehen unter dem Einflüsse des Bibellateins."

Friedländer[1] maintained that it was a Hebraism. But its appearance in non-African authors and non-Semitic languages seems conclusively to refute this view.

(6) *Of a substantive with a synonymous adjective.*

e.g. Ap. *Met.* VI. 10, prompta velocitate.
Arnob. III. 29, vetustas prisca.
ib. V. 1, arcana mysteria, etc.
But cf. Verg. *Aen.* IX. 89, anxius timor.
Catull. 64. 237, laeta gaudia.
Tib. I. 3. 16, tardae morae.
Inscr. Orelli 4452 (Gaul), perpetuae aeternitati.

Cf also Plaut. *Pseud.* 65, suavis suaviatio (sometimes written in one word—"suavisuaviatio").

(7) *The multiplication of pronouns.*

(1) *quis...quisquam,* Fr. 18[2].

But cf. Plaut. *Most.* 256, *Aul.* 803 (Wagner), and Greek τίς...τις. *quisquam* is sometimes found with *nemo and nihil*[3],

e.g. Plaut. *Cas.* 1008, Ter. *Eun.* 226, Suet. *Tib.* 12, Gell. II. 6. 9.

(2) *hic idem,* Ap. *Met.* I. 23.

But cf. Col. XI. 3. 24.

(3) *idem ipse,* Gell. XI. 13. 5.

(4) *hic talis,* Ap. *Met.* I. 6. Cf. *talis ille* (*ib.* IX. 15), *hic iste, hic ille, idem ille,* etc.

These are all taken from the common speech; they occur occasionally even in Cicero[4]; e.g. *ad Att.* I. 16. 8,

[1] Cf. Friedländer's note on Petron. 37.

[2] Heindorf emends to *qui...quisquam* (so Naber); but the codex has *quis*, which Studemund retains.

[3] Cf. Dräger, *op. cit.* I. p. 99.

[4] Cf. *ib.* I. p. 104 for instances in Cicero.

idem ego ille...idem, inquam, ego....Especially frequent is the use of *suus sibi*, etc., which is also, according to Dräger[1], a vulgarism.

e.g. Ap. *Met.* I. 6, a suis sibi parentibus hilarare compellitur.

Cf. *ib.* I. 10, VI. 30, VIII. 14, etc.; and *Apol.* 69, sua sibi voce suisque verbis sese revincat.

Gell. V. 10. 16, Min. Fel. 10. 4, Lact. *Inst.* III. 28. 20, etc.

But cf. Plaut. *Capt.* 81, suo sibi suco vivont. Cf. *ib.* prol. 5, *Amph.* 269, Ter. *Ad.* 958, Vitruv. VIII. 6. 3, Petron. 66, Colum. XII. 7 and 41. Cf. *C. I. L.* XII. 2, 40, 236, etc.

In addition to these and similar specific forms of pleonasm, there is a general tendency towards exuberance of expression in many of the Africans, and especially in Apuleius.

Cf. e.g. Ap. *Apol.* 94: rescripsit mihi per eum quas litteras, dii boni, qua doctrina, quo lepore, qua verborum amoenitate simul et iucunditate.

Ap. *Met.* V. 12, dies ultima et casus extremus et sexus infestus et sanguis inimicus iam sumpsit arma et castra commovit et aciem direxit et classicum personavit.

ib. Met. II. 4, canes utrumque secus Deae latera muniunt, qui canes et ipsi lapis erant.

ib. Met. II. 31, solemnis dies...quo die.

Cf. Fr. 101, simili similius; 196, pleno plenius.

Ap. *Met.* IX. 41, certo certius; Min. Fel. 16, incerto certior.

But for the promiscuous heaping up of synonyms it

[1] *ib.* I. pp. 76, 77.

would be hard to rival the non-African Orestes Trag. 557—9,

> pectora cor sensus animum praecordia mentem
> conturbat pietas dolor anxia maeror origo
> affectus natura pudor reverentia fama.

Although in many of the Africans pleonasm of all kinds is specially frequent, the particular forms which this pleonasm takes are rarely peculiar to Africa. Some are the ordinary pleonasms of the common people, who generally say more, not less, than they mean; others are simply for the sake of emphasis. The African is not the only man who repeats a word, or uses two words instead of one, when he wants to drive a point home. Even Caesar the purist can say *pridie eius diei*[1].

Nowhere is pleonasm more in evidence than in the epitaphs on the gravestones, which, according to Olcott[2], "far surpass those of the other provinces in strained and overloaded expressions." He quotes:

C. I. L. 352: homo bonus rebus hominibusq. pernecessarius quem quaerit patriae maximus hic populus;

3531: coniugi humanissimae, sanctissimae, fidelissimae, obsequentissimae;

and *E.* 290: incomparabilis coniunx, mater bona, avia piissima, pudica, religiosa, laboriosa, frugi, efficaxs, vigilans, sollicita, univira, unicuba, totius industriae et fidei matrona.

To these we might add 9021, 9024, 9064, 9142, 646, 2391, 14, 726 (2—6), 1542, 1179 (4—6), 500 (5), 499 (4, 5),

[1] Cf. *b. Gall.* i. 47. 2, etc.

[2] Olcott, *op. cit.* p. xx. For varieties of pleonasm on African inscriptions cf. Max. Hoffmann, *op. cit.* p. 144.

827 (6, 7) and many others which show conspicuous accumulation of epithets. Nevertheless there is nothing peculiarly "African" about these eulogies upon the departed; the Africans are not the only nation which showers superlatives upon its dead[1]. We find the same in Gaul[2] and Spain, and although it would perhaps be difficult to rival *E.* 290 (*sup. cit.*) we may compare:

C. I. L. XII. (Gall. Narb.) 23, filio supra modum aetatis pientissimo.

ib. 3377, marito optimo et karissimo et pientissimo.

ib. 78, Pio F(elici) Invicto Augusto restitutori orbis providentissimo retro principum ac super omnes fortissimo. Cf. *ib.* 1972, 2179, 5758, etc.;

and V. (Gall. Cis.) 5202, puer...omnium rerum bonarum melior.

Cf. *ib.* 3344, 6286, 4609, etc.

Cf. also XIV. (Latium) 4276, coniux c(arissima) domina d(ulcissima) indulgen(tissima) piissim(a) anima locu... candidis(sima) simplici(ssima) iucund(issima) excellen-(tissima) bene mer(ens) (omnia) bono dign(a). Cf. *ib.* 936, 3579 (23—26), 173.

X. (Sardinia) 7795, magnae integritatis vir, bonus pater orfanorum, inopum refugium, peregrinorum fautor, religiosissimus adquae exercitatissimus totius sinceritatis disciplin(a). Cf. *ib.* 4863, 478, etc.

[1] Cf. J. Pirson in *Musée Belge*, 1898, Vol. 2 ("Le style des inscriptions latines de la Gaule"), pp. 116, 117: "Cette redondance ne procède, après tout, que de la liberté du parler populaire, qui n'est pas, comme la langue littéraire, astreinte aux règles parfois sévères de la raison ou du goût; d'ailleurs, le sentiment qu'il traduit est trop humain pour être spécial à l'Afrique."

[2] For pleonasms in Gaul, cf. J. Pirson, *La Langue des inscriptions latines de la Gaule*, pp. 299 ff. and p. 162.

II. (Spain) 6115, sorori pientissimae et incomparabilissimae.

IX. (Calabria, Apulia, etc.) 2437, 1448 (coiux super omnes incomparabili), 2243, etc.

Cf. also II. (Spain) 414:

septuaginta tecum transfers non amplius annos
debueras tamen habuisse *mille*,

with an African inscription, cited by Cagnat[1], where the same thought is expressed, but in a less extravagant form:

non digne felix, citto vitam caruisti! misella!
vivere debueras annis fere *centum*; licebat.

Exaggeration and accumulated epithets are the natural and universal features of the epitaph, and for instances of this particular "Africanism" we need go no further than the nearest churchyard.

B. Stylistic ornaments and devices, due to the influence of rhetoric.

(i) *The extensive use of abstracts* (cf. *diminutives, sup.*).

These, which are frequently in the plural, are a feature of the prose of Apuleius[2], Cyprian[3] and Tertullian.

e.g. Cyp. 600. 2, acerbationes; *ib.* 500. 13, dignationes, etc.

Tert. *de Spect.* 29, simplicitates; *Apol.* 19, concatenationes temporum; cf. Lact. IV. 26. 18, acerbitates et amaritudines.

But they are no new invention and are found right through ante-classical and classical Latin[4].

[1] Cf. R. Cagnat in *Rév. de Phil.* XIII. 1889, pp. 51 ff.

[2] Cf. Koziol, *op. cit.* p. 251. [3] Cf. Watson, *op. cit.* p. 214.

[4] Sittl (*Lok. Versch.* p. 107) ascribed this to Semitic influence (since Punic has no adverb).

Two favourite uses of the abstract in the Latin of this period are:

(1) *An abstract in the genitive as equivalent to an adjective,*

e.g. Min. Fel. 26. 8, errorem pravitatis.
Vict. Vit. pref. 4, obedientiae cervicem.
But cf. Cic. *ad Fam.* XV. 4. 14, aliqua vis desiderii; Ennod. 218. 8, epistula admonitionis, etc.

(2) *An abstract in the ablative as equivalent to an adverb.*

e.g. Ap. *Met.* I. 15, misericordia; Cyp. 225. 9, ignoratione; Tert. *Apol.* 21, diligentia, etc. But cf. Vitruv. X. 2. 1, necessitate = necessario.

Corssen[1] also notes the number of *women's names with abstract terminations* which occur on African inscriptions:
e.g. 4159, Aeternitas.
9586, Caritas.
Cf. Felicitas, Pietas, Hilaritas, Voluptas, etc.
But cf. II. (Spain) 1454, Felicitas. Cf. 797, 3078, 2312, etc.
X. (S. Italy, Sicily and Sardinia) 2044, 6272, 7894, etc.
And *C. I. L.* indices *pass.*

(ii) *The multiplication of Historic Infinitives*[2].

e.g. Ap. *Met.* VIII. 7 (12), Fr. 207 (17).
But cf. Plaut. *Merc.* 46 ff. (7), Sall. *Iug.* 66. 1 (11), *ib.* 94. 5 (13), Sall. *Cat.* 31 (12), *ib.* 27. 2 (10), Tac. *Agric.* 38 (10), *ib.* 5 (7).

[1] In *Kritische Nachträge*, p. 276.
[2] Cf. Wölfflin in *Archiv* X. pp. 177 ff. and Dräger, *op. cit.* I. pp. 329 ff.

Monceaux connects these infinitives, when they occur in African authors, with the Semitic "noms d'actions"; but they are merely the usual infinitives of narration, which are found in Livy and especially in Sallust. The construction was a favourite one at this period, but it was not introduced by the African school.

(iii) *The extensive use of figures.*

It is impossible to go into the use of figures by the African school in any detail. That has already been done in the works upon individual authors, such as Apuleius[1], Cyprian[2], Tertullian[3], and Augustine[4], to which reference is constantly being made. All these authors use the approved rhetorical figures of thought and language on a lavish scale and with great boldness.

Cf. Tert. *Apol.* 4, nonne et vos cotidie experimentis inluminantibus tenebras antiquitatis totam illam veterem et squalentem silvam legum novis principalium rescriptorum et edictorum securibus truncatis et caeditis?

ib. 13, circuit cauponas religio mendicans.

Cyp. 353. 3, effossi et fatigati montes.

Aug. *Serm.* 1. 2, fracta superbiae cervice.

ib. 1. 4, in sui erroris nubilo.

Ap. *Met.* v. 12, sanguis inimicus iam sumpsit arma etc.

This free use of figures is the natural effect of a rhetorical education upon men whose bent lay, like that of Apuleius, towards the expressive and the picturesque.

[1] Kretschmann, *op. cit.* p. 21; Koziol, *op. cit.* pp. 197 ff. and pp. 240 ff.

[2] Cf. Watson, *op. cit.* pp. 207 ff.

[3] Cf. Hoppe, *op. cit.* pp. 85 ff.

[4] Cf. A. Regnier, *De la latinité des sermons de Saint Augustin*, Paris, 1886.

There is little that is original, however, in the use which the Africans make of the figures of thought, but a few of the more striking of the figures of language deserve a brief consideration.

(1) *Alliteration*[1].

This is so common as hardly to require illustration, for it occurs on almost every page of Apuleius[2], Fronto, and Tertullian, and is very common in Cyprian.

e.g. Fr. 45, 46, te tutum intus in tranquilla sinu suo... tutatur.

ib. 64, vim verbi ac venustatem.

ib. 67, rancidos racemos et acidos acinos.

M. A. *ap.* Fr. 68, fortia facinora fecimus.

Fr. 101, deos quaeso sit salvus sator, salva sint sata, salva seges sit[3].

Ap. *Met.* VI. 8, septem savia suavia (where it is combined with assonance).

Cyp. 732. 8, Puppianus solus integer inviolatus sanctus pudicus (where it is combined with chiasmus).

Aug. *Serm.* 44. 4, O vanitas vendens vanitatem vanitati.

Alliteration is a feature of old Latin verse, as it is of the primitive poetry of other countries, and its presence in the Africans is largely an outcome of the archaistic revival. It is found in the language of law and ritual[4],

[1] Cf. *sup.* pp. 145, 146, and Wölfflin in *Archiv* IX. pp. 567 ff.

[2] Cf. Kretschmann, *op. cit.* pp. 13 ff. and Koziol, *op. cit.* pp. 208 ff.

[3] L. Ehrenthal, *op. cit.* p. 42, thinks that this is a quotation from an old Latin poet, and that it originally ran: "Salvu' sator sit, salva sient sata, salva seges sit."

[4] Cf. Tab. XII. 2: "si servus furtum faxit noxiamve noxit." Cf. Dea Dia; mater matuta; ops opifera; pater patratus; sacro sanctus, etc. Cf. *C. I. L.* I. 603: "donum datum donatum dedicatumque."

and to some extent even in that of the classical period[1].

Cf. Cic. *pro Cluent.* 35. 96, non fuit istud igitur iudicium iudicii simile, iudices.

ib. pro Sulla 19, cum caedes, cum civum cruor, cum cinis patriae versari...coeperat.

Hor. *Od.* III. 13. 15, loquaces lymphae.

Publ. Syr. *ap.* Petron. 55, luxuriae rictu Martis marcent moenia.

Sen. *Ep.* 90. 18, nos omnia nobis difficilia facilium fastidio fecimus.

It is still in vogue in the time of Ennodius[2], in whom, on the other hand, assonance and rhyme are rare.

(2) *Assonance and rhyme*[3].

Assonance in the African authors is due partly to the influence of Greek rhetoric, and especially to that of Gorgias, and partly, like alliteration, to the archaistic revival, for it too is native to the Latin tongue and is found in the old Latin poetry and prose and occasionally even in the classical writers.

Cf. Cato *ap.* Cic. *de orat.* II. 256, nobiliorem mobiliorem.

Cf. Cic. (quoted in Quint. IX. 4. 41 from a letter to Brutus), res mihi invisae visae sunt.

de off. I. 61, pleniore ore.

pro Plancio 1. 3, de re reoque.

[1] Alliteration is found occasionally in Greek poetry (cf. Hom. *Il.* IV. 526, Soph. *Aj.* 866), but it is avoided as a rule in Greek prose (though cf. Plato, *Phaedo*, 78 D).

[2] Though cf. *ib.* 351. 25 (et ore...et pectore), 150. 24: "unum velle... et unum nolle."

[3] Cf. Wöfflin in *Archiv* I. pp. 350 ff. Cf. *sup.* pp. 144 ff.

And, from the poem on his consulship, the famous jingle:

O fortunatam natam me consule Romam.

It is not found to any extent in Petronius or the *bellum Hispanum*, and is not a "popular" usage. It is employed to excess by Fronto, Apuleius, Tertullian, Cyprian, and St Augustine.

Cf. Fr. 233, neque mensum neque pensum.

ib. 19 (from Laberius), beneficia...veneficia.

ib. 8, satis odoris, parum roboris.

ib. 7, grati pariter et gratuiti. Cf. Ap. *Met.* I. 35. M. A. (*ap.* Fr. 36), palantes balantesque.

ib. p. 35, projectus...provectus.

Cf. Cyp. 405. 12, cum sudore ac labore.

ib. 765. 7, laudabiles ac probabiles, etc., etc.

But it is only found occasionally in Minucius Felix (cf. 7. 3 spumantibus...fumantibus) and is very rare in Gellius and Arnobius.

In the Christian authors assonance may possibly have been fostered by the influence of the Hebrew Scriptures, where it is frequent in the popular poetry, the narrative prose and the prophets; no such supposition, however, is necessary in order to account for its vogue among writers trained in pagan rhetoric.

Assonance in many forms is, of course, very easily achieved in Latin, owing to the number of case endings and verbal terminations of similar sound[1]. Another common figure, which is used both with and without assonance, is

[1] Dion. Hal. *de Comp. Verb.* 12 maintains that assonance is good, but not when it degenerates into jingle. He disapproves of the monotonous effect of recurring case-terminations.

(3) *Parallelism,* the Greek παρίσωσις, the balancing of similar clauses.

This is especially common in Apuleius[1] and Cyprian; indeed the latter especially introduces otiose words in order to achieve it, and takes endless trouble to arrange his words in pairs and threes.

Cf. Ap. *Met.* VIII. 4, aper...pilis inhorrentibus, corio squalidus, setis insurgentibus, spina hispidus, dentibus attritu sonaci spumens, oculis aspectu minaci flammeus.

ib. Flor. IV., nascentis... senescentis... delinquentis (lunae).

Cyp. 598. 21, ostiatim per multorum domos vel oppidatim per quasdam civitates discurrentes.

ib. 313. 35, qualis illic caelestium regnorum voluptas sine timore moriendi et cum aeternitate vivendi quam summa et perpetua felicitas (i.e. parisosis, rhyme, antithesis, and chiasmus).

This device, a favourite one with Greek rhetoricians, is still found in later Gallic Latin.

Cf. Ennod. 319. 4, scit diu exspectare immodico labore quaesitos, nescit pro vilibus despicere magno pretio comparatos.

It was no doubt Apuleius who popularised it, and Boissier[2] has called attention to the peculiar refinement of assonance combined with parallelism which he introduced, and which consisted in a sort of relation between adjectives and verbs, corresponding two by two or three by three, with regularly recurring assonance.

Cf. Ap. *Flor.* I. 1, ut...moris est...votum postulare, pomum adponere, paulisper adsidere (rhymes in -e),...aut

[1] Cf. Koziol, *op. cit.* pp. 201 ff.

[2] Boissier, *Rom. Af.* pp. 264, 265, note.

ara floribus redimita, aut spelunca frondibus adumbrata, aut quercus cornibus onerata aut fagus pellibus coronata (rhymes in -a), vel enim colliculus sepimine consecratus, vel truncus dolamine effigiatus, vel cespes libamine umigatus, vel lapis unguine delibutus (rhymes in -e and -us). It gives almost the effect of rhyming prose, and is sometimes combined also with alliteration of the first letter.

Cf. *Met.* IV. 8, pulmentis acervatim, panibus aggeratim, poculis agminatim ingestis.

Tertullian[1], Minucius Felix, Cyprian and Augustine follow Apuleius in this device.

Cf. Cyp. 267. 3, fundamenta aedificandae spei, firmamenta conroborandae fidei, etc.

Aug. *Serm.* 219 *in.*, vigilat iste, mentibus piis fervens et lucescens; vigilat ille, dentibus suis frendens et tabescens.

It is merely a further development of the Isocratic ὁμοιοτέλευτον, which even Cicero did not despise.

Cf. *Phil.* XII. 7. 15, 16, ubi sunt, C. Pansa, illae cohortationes pulcherrimae tuae, quibus a te excitatus senatus, inflammatus populus Romanus, non solum audivit, sed etiam didicit, nihil esse homini Romano foedius servitute. Idcircone saga sumpsimus, arma cepimus, iuventutem omnem ex tota Italia excussimus, ut exercitu florentissimo et maximo legati ad pacem mitterentur[2]?

[1] Cf. rei modicus, spei immodicus, etc.; cf. Hoppe, *op. cit.* pp. 162 ff.

[2] Cf. L. Laurand, *Études sur le style des discours de Ciceron*, Paris, 1907, p. 124. Cf. also Cic. *Orat.* 49. 165: "est enim, iudices, haec non scripta sed nata lex," etc. (from *pro Mil.* 4. 10).

(4) *The* figura etymologica[1].

This device, which has been seriously claimed as an Africanism, is found also in Greek literature, is frequent in old Latin comedy, in Sallust and in Livy, and, although it does not occur in Caesar, is far from uncommon in Cicero. Like other figures it is popular with the Africans, and is common throughout the Vulgate. It is still in use in the Gallic school.

Cf. Fr. 95,	precibus precari.
ib. 226,	auctibus augere.
ib. 207,	vigiliam vigilare.
Cyp. 259. 15,	induere indumentum.
ib. 512. 4,	superantem superare.
ib. 725. 9,	tenere tenorem.
But cf. Plaut. *Merc.* 473,	vitam vivere.
ib. Capt. 391,	servitutem servire.
Cato, *Orig.* fr. 105,	cognobiliorem cognitionem.
Liv. XXIX. 27. 3,	auctibus augere, etc.
Ennod. 407. 18,	regna regimus.

(5) *Word-play.*

This, too, is a characteristic of old Latin and a device for which the Romans appear never to have lost their taste. Like other embellishments, it was used to excess by the Africans, but it received the approval and patronage even of Cicero[2]. It is very frequent in Plautus and Terence.

Cf. Ter. *Heaut.* prol. 41 (*causa*).

Cf. *ib.* Hec. *prol.* 55, Cic. *ad Att.* VII. 3. 5.

Cic. *Verr.* (ii) v. 68. 174 (*locus*).

[1] Cf. G. Landgraf in *Acta Sem. Phil. Erlangensis* II. 1881, pp. 1 ff.

[2] Cic. *de orat.* II. 64.

M. A. *ap.* Fr. 29, o si ad singula capita caput tuum basiare possem.

ib. ap. Fr. 56, stabis...constabit. *ib.* 93, valeant...valeas.

It is not very common in Cyprian; cf. however 402. 14 (palma). Cf. Aug. *Serm.* 219 *in.*, et qui vident in Domino et qui invident Domino. Cf. *ib.* 216. 2.

It is found also in Greek. Cf. Isocr. IV. 119. *ἀρχῆς* (rule)...*ἀρχή* (beginning).

One of the favourite forms which word-play assumes is punning upon proper names[1].

Cf. Cic. *ad Att.* VI. 1. 25 (where Cicero puns on the names Brutus and Lepidus), and cf. old Latin Comedy, *pass.*

Cf. Cyp. 616. 10, Novatiani et Novati novas...machinas;

Ap. *Met.* II. 14, Aug. *Serm.* 28. 1, Perpetua et Felicitas, coronis martyrii decoratae, perpetua felicitate floruerunt.

This variety of word-play is still in vogue in the Gallic school. Cf. Ennod. 453. 15 (Arator), etc.

(6) *The employment of rhythmical effects in prose.*

There is nothing new in the employment of rhythm by the Africans. Although rhythmical endings to clauses are far commoner in Apuleius, Tertullian and Cyprian[2] than in Cicero, and these authors tend to exaggerate and abuse this device, which Cicero, insisting as he did upon the distinction between rhythm and metre, used with such restraint, portions of verses do occur even in the classical writers: "versus saepe in oratione per imprudentiam dicimus[3]." Metrical endings too, such as "abesse videtur,"

[1] Cf. Watson, *op. cit.* p. 211. [2] Cf. *ib.* pp. 217 ff.

[3] Cf. Cic. *Brut.* 8. 32 (cf. Arist. *Rhet.* III. 8: *ῥυθμὸν δεῖ ἔχειν τὸν λόγον μέτρον δὲ μή.* Cic. *Orat.* 56. 189.

"sciunt placuisse Catoni," "deplorare solebant," are fairly common in Cicero. Cf. also the hendecasyllabic line in *Verr.* (ii) III. 16. 43, "succrescit tibi Lucius Metellus."

Cf. Liv. I. 1, facturusne operae pretium sim (cf. Quint. IX. 4. 74).

Tac. *Ann.* I. 1 (urbem), Romam a principio reges habuere.

ib. XV. 9, subiectis campis magna specie volitabant.

Sen. *de Clem.* II. 5. 4, maerór contundit méntes, abicit, cóntrahit.

Cf. M. A. *ap.* Fr. 94[1] (nam quem) sponte dei iuvisse volunt et dignum ope (sua iudicant); where by the substitution of "ducunt" for "sua iudicant," a metrical line is obtained.

Fr. 209, causa facti latet, factum spectatur; where by reversing the position of *causa* and *facti* we obtain facti causa latet, factum spectatur.

Ap. *Met.* II. 4, splendet intus umbra signi de nitore lapides, where the quantities, of course, are wrong, but the line is approximating in rhythm to a trochaic tetrameter catalectic.

But in spite of this extensive use of figures by most of the African writers, there is nothing here so individual or so consistent as to justify the assumption that there was any *one* peculiarly "African" style. On the one hand Valerius Maximus, for instance, rivals any of the Africans

[1] Cf. Ehrenthal, *op. cit.* ch. 2. Ehrenthal finds numerous hidden verses in Fronto, which he thinks ought to be recognised as quotations. Many of his instances involve a change of order. Sittl (*Jahresbericht* LV. p. 239) thinks that to attempt to find metrical writing everywhere is to confuse the letter with satire, and that to seek hexameters is especially hazardous.

in bombast, in abuse of grammar[1] and rhetoric and in obscurity of diction, and the Gallic Ennodius is not far behind; and on the other hand we find in Africa pure Classicists, such as Lactantius the Ciceronian[2]. Apuleius himself is often more Ciceronian than "African" in his rhetorical and philosophical works; while the critic who, having formed a theory of African style, points to Tertullian, passionate, violent, unrestrained, as its typical exponent, will find it difficult to find a place in that theory for his pupil, the calm and eminently reasonable Cyprian[3].

[1] Cf. A. Dubois, *La Latinité d'Ennodius*, Paris, 1903, p. 12. He finds in Ennodius exactly the so-called "African" tendency to abuse all the resources and exaggerate the usages of classical Latin: "En voulant trop bien écrire le latin, cet auteur a achevé de le gâter."

[2] The pupil of Arnobius, to whom he forms a striking contrast. His ideal is the Ciceronian *copia*. Cf. I. 1. 10, I. 15. 16, etc. Cf. Monceaux, *L'Af. Chrét.* III. p. 357: "D'ordinaire il renferme son idée dans une période presque cicéronienne, bien proportionnée et de dimensions moyennes, savamment equilibrée, harmonieuse, rhythmée suivant toutes les règles de la prose métrique."

[3] For the comparison of the styles of Tert. and Cyp. cf. Fr. Ritter, "Die Ersten Schriftsteller Afrika's," in *Zeitschrift f. philos. u. Kath. Theol.* VIII. 1883, pp. 32 ff.; and for a more detailed discussion cf. L. Bayard, *Le Latin de St Cyprien*, pp. 319 ff. where the descriptions of Job in Tert. *de patient.* 14 and Cyp. *de bono pat.* 18 are contrasted. Cf. *ib.* p. 320: "La peinture de Tertullien est toute en traits brusques et fiers, mais pleine d'éclat et de couleur et d'un réalisme hardi. Celle de son imitateur est plus discrète, les tons y sont moins vifs, mais mieux fondus, les traits moins vigoureux mais disposés avec plus de regularité, et une symétrie parfaite; le personnage ressort moins." Bayard adds (*ib.* p. 327) "A mesure que l'on a étudié la question, on s'est aperçu que bien des particularités que l'on donnait comme caractéristiques du latin d'Afrique se retrouvaient ailleurs et parfois à Rome même." Cf. E. W. Watson, *op. cit.* pp. 197 ff. Of Cyprian's style he says: "In its literary aspects it is closely akin to that of Ammianus and the panegyrists; in its grammatical, to that of Vitruvius" (*ib.* p. 241); while Monceaux (*L'Af. Chrét.* II. p. 358) describes it thus: "En somme par les proportions et le moule de la phrase, il se rattache surtout à la tradition cicéronienne.

The originality of Africa in respect of style stands in sharp contrast to the conventionality of Gaul. Pichon, while denying the existence of a Gallic Latinity, admits a certain uniformity of style in the Gallic school. "Nos Gaulois sont plus dociles aux règles recues, plus fidèles aux habitudes inveterées, plus respectueux des modèles consacrés[1]." But the characteristic feature of the African school is the freedom with which each author follows the bent of his own individual genius[2]. In a country which produced side by side opportunists and martyrs, compromise and inexorable obstinacy[3], men could express themselves in many ways. We have only to turn to the art of Africa to realise how easy it is to exaggerate the influence of climate, national temperament and surroundings. Even the champions of *Africitas* have to admit that African art is dominated throughout by the Roman spirit, that it is essentially Roman and not African, and that[4] "neither in painting, sculpture nor architecture nor any branch of the decorative arts are there any indications of the in-

Par le détail, il se rapproche des Africains des générations précédentes." Minucius Felix also is to a great extent a Ciceronian. Cf. Monceaux, *ib.* p. 507. His style is "une singulière combinaison de la periode pseudocicéronienne avec la *sententia* de Sénèque et avec la petite phrase pittoresque d'Apulée ou de Tertullien."

[1] Cf. René Pichon, *Les écrivains latins de la Gaule*, p. 4. On Gallic Latinity cf. *ib.* pp. 13 ff.

[2] Cf. Boissier, *Rom. Af.* p. 271. He urges that the Gallic school, on the other hand, strove to write well, that is, like those who have written well, and that good sense and a simple, clear, direct style are characteristic of the Gallic writers in general.

[3] Cf. Boissier, *Fin du Paganisme* I. pp. 222 ff.: "L'influence des milieux n'est pas aussi souveraine que l'on dit ..le même pays peut produire à la même époque des opportunistes et des intransigeants."

[4] Cf. Alex. Graham, *Roman Africa*, p. 302 (Graham is himself a supporter of Africanisms in the language).

fluence exercised by climate, habits of life or national sentiment....The ideal played no part in the arts of Africa. There is nothing to remind us of the soil or the daily life of an ancient people. There is nothing, in fact, of African growth." "Presque tous les édifices" says Toutain, one of the greatest authorities on Roman Africa, "qui s'élevèrent dans les antiques cités africaines aux trois premiers siècles de l'empire, furent construits sur le modèle et sur le plan des monuments de Rome[1]." As in the other provinces, so in Africa, we find everywhere the basilica and the amphitheatre, the triumphal arch and the temple, fountains and aqueducts, bridges and tombs, all after Roman designs. In architecture, sculpture and mosaic all is borrowed. "Ils n'ont su les renouveler par aucun trait original; ils n'ont eu l'idée d'y ajouter aucun détail caracteristique[2]." "Rien n'est sorti du sol même, du cœur des vieilles populations; rien n'est punique[3]." The literature and the art of a country commonly go hand in hand, and it seems hardly credible that the Roman influence, so all-powerful in the realm of art, should not make itself felt in the sphere of language and literature; in short that while African art was Roman or Graeco-Roman, African literature was Punic.

Hitherto we have been dealing in the main with the literary language; it remains to consider briefly the Latin which was spoken in Africa, and for which the inscriptions are our only guide.

[1] J. Toutain, *Les cités romaines de la Tunisie*, p. 108.

[2] *ib.* pp. 110 ff.

[3] *ib.* p. 120. Toutain describes the whole physiognomy of an African village (ch. viii.), and finds it in no way original. The very household utensils are "banal et sans caractère ou d'origine exotique."

In considering inscriptional evidence it is necessary first to emphasize the fact that, even if we were to prove thereby the existence of a *popular* dialectal form of Latin in Africa, this would not suffice in itself to substantiate the existence of a *literary* African Latin, since literary Latin, in Africa as elsewhere, was an artificial creation, in no way dependent upon popular talk. That is to say, it would have been quite possible for the common people to talk, and to write upon their inscriptions, a dialectal form of Latin, while African rhetoricians were writing Ciceronian prose. As a matter of fact, however, we shall find that inscriptional evidence tells against *Africitas*, and that the inscriptions of all the Roman provinces exhibit very similar characteristics.

In handling this inscriptional evidence we are not hampered by that dearth of contemporary non-African work which proved such a stumbling-block in the case of literary Latin. There are, however, three main causes which tend to vitiate the testimony of inscriptions as to the actual spoken language: first, the influence upon the stonemason of conventional styles[1]; secondly, the fact that not every inscription found in Africa is necessarily by an African; and thirdly the efforts on the part of the masses to appear educated. As we noted above, the uneducated

[1] Cf. R. Cagnat in *Rev. de Phil.* XIII. 1889, pp. 51—65. He proves the existence of archetypes and manuals for masons by the recurrence of familiar tag, sometimes slightly altered in such a way as to do violence to the metre: e.g. II. 1487 (Spain), where the tag "sit tibi terra levis" becomes "sit vobis terra levis." Cf. Sittl, *Was ist Vulgär-Latein?* (*sup. cit.*), p. 388: "Wo noch die *konventionellen* Quadratbuchstaben herrschen, haben wir auch eine konventionellen Sprache zu erwarten." Of course a considerable number of the inscriptions contain nothing more illuminating than the proper names, age, and position of the dead.

man cannot be relied upon to write exactly as he speaks, especially when he is trying not to appear uneducated, and no written material can be really satisfactory evidence as to the character of a spoken product. Nevertheless in spite of these drawbacks the inscriptions are a most valuable guide to the talk of the common people, whose efforts to display the learning which they did not possess are often, fortunately for us, a failure. "Auf den Inschriften," writes Kübler (to whose article[1] I am greatly indebted), "reden bisweilen ganz ungebildete Leute, auch sie zwar oft in rührenden Eifer Bildung zu zeigen, aber, Gott sei Dank! meist ohne jeden Erfolg."

The papers of Kübler and Kroll[2] are easily accessible, and it is unnecessary to go over again the ground which they have covered. For the sake of completeness, however, a brief summary of Kübler's results shall be given, and some of the most interesting of the so-called "Africanisms" in word-formation and vocabulary shall be examined in greater detail, as illustrated by both literary and inscriptional evidence.

As regards *Inflection* and *Syntax* Kübler finds no important differences between the African inscriptions and the inscriptions of other provinces, the Latin of Lower Italy, as we have it in Petronius, the Pompeian *graffiti* and the wax-tablets; and to construct any system of African Latin syntax would, in his opinion, be rash.

The loss of final *-m* or *-s*, the substitution of *e* for *i*, and *vice versa*, which have been included by some scholars in the list of Africanisms, are common to vulgar Latin of

[1] Cf. B. Kübler, "Die lateinische Sprache auf afrikanischen Inschriften," in *Archiv* VIII. pp. 165 ff.

[2] Cf. W. Kroll in *Rhein. Mus.* 22, 1897, pp. 569 ff.

all countries. Nor are *metaplasta* and *heteroclita* peculiar to Africa; we find *generes* for *generi* in Accius, *aribus* for *aris* in inscriptions from Tarraconensis, Lusitania and Ostia[1], *effigia* for *effigies* in Plautus and Afranius[2], etc. Deponents, again, are used for passives in all vulgar Latin, and of the confusion of moods, tenses[3], genders, and case forms we have already spoken. They are as common in non-African inscriptions as in non-African literature.

As regards *word-formation* Kübler finds that many forms thought to be peculiarly African are not specially numerous on the African inscriptions; e.g. substantives in *-tor, -trix, -men, -mentum,* and adjectives in *-bilis*; while others, e.g. adjectives in *-icius, -alis,* and proper names in *-osus, -ica, -itta,* he finds to be specially prevalent in Africa. Olcott[4] (whose book deals exclusively with substantives and adjectives) maintains that there is a greater freedom in word-formation generally in Africa than elsewhere, and claims as especially African *-alis, -torius* (*-torium*), *-arius* (*-arium*), *-icius,* and *-tio.* A few of these and other terminations which have been claimed as African deserve brief illustration, both inscriptional and literary.

[1] Cf. also the indices to *C. I. L.*; e.g. in Spain (ii) we find *filias* (nom.) (38), *dibus* (325, 2710, 4424, 4490), etc.; in Calabria, Apulia, Samnium, etc. (ix) we find dibus (3912), committentum (gen. pl. 2641), ullo (dat. 980); in Latium (xiv) aliquis (abl. pl. 3608. 21), filibus (=filiis) 849; in South Italy, Sicily and Sardinia (x) nymphabus (6799), dibus (8249, etc.), nepotorum (2015), etc.

[2] Cf. Plaut. *Rud.* 421; Afran. *ap.* Non. VIII. p. 790; cf. *effigiae*, Lucr. IV. 105.

[3] Cf. esp. *plup. subj. for imperf.*, which was most strenuously claimed as an Africanism and appears only once on an African inscription, *vid. sup.* pp. 193, 194. So too Kübler finds hardly any inscriptional evidence for peculiarities in the use of prepositions.

[4] G. N. Olcott, *op. cit.* p. xix.

(i) *Adjectives* in

1. *-aneus.*

e.g. subitaneus, Vulg. Sap. 17. 6, 19. 16.
But cf. Col. I. 6. 24, II. 4. 4.
succidaneus, Fr. 118, 119, Ap. *Met.* VIII. 26 (or succedaneus).
But cf. Plaut. *Epid.* 140, S. C. *ap.* Gell. IV. 6. 2, Ennod. 48. 23.
confusaneus, Gell. *pref.* 5, Ap. *Met.* III. 2.
But cf. Cic. *ad Att.* II. 1. 11.

So too in Cicero we have *consentaneus, supervacaneus* (cf. Sallust); in Varro (*ap.* Non. II. p. 133) *conditaneus*; in Gaius (*Inst.* I. 39) *collactaneus* (cf. inscr. XIV. 2413, Latium); in Columella (IX. 14. 15) *interaneus*, etc. The suffix seems to be vulgar and mostly early.

Cf. also nouns in *-aneum,*
e g. tyranopaneum, IV. 4906 (Pompeii).

2. *-bilis.*

e.g. inobscurabilis, Tert. *de anim.* 3.
inconvertibilis, *ib. de Carn. Christ.* 3.
intelligibilis, Vulg. Sap. 7. 23.
But cf. Sen. *Ep.* 124. 2.
inamabilis, Ap. *Met.* V. 29.
perflabilis, *ib.* III. 17.
inexstinguibilis, Vulg. Sap. 7. 10.
But cf. Varro *ap.* Non. II. p. 190.
repraehensibilis, M. A. *ap.* Fr. 44, Lact. *Inst.* VII. 19.
delectabilis, Gell. I. 11. 4.
But cf. Tac. *Ann.* XII. 67.

Arnobius especially favours this ending:

Cf. frustrabilis (II. 22).
irrevocabilis (II. 5).
inculpabilis, inemendabilis, irreprehensibilis } (II. 15).

But it occurs right through Roman literature:

e.g. aequiparabilis, Plaut. *Curc.* 168.
visibilis, Plin. *N. H.* XI. 37. 54.

Cf. also inscriptions *pass.*

Cf. debilis, IV. 1951 (Pompeii), cf. XIV. 678, 779, etc. (Latium).
incomparabilis, VII. 25 (Britain).
amabilis, XII. 1817 (Gall. Narb.) *et pass.*
sperabilis, V. 7047 (Gall. Cis.).
indeprehensibilis, XIV. 64 (Latium), etc., etc.

Cf. also the numerous adverbs in *-biliter* and *-abiliter* at Pompeii:

e.g. festinabiliter, IV. 4758.
inclinabiliter, *ib.* 5406.
arrurabiliter, *ib.* 4126.
ceventinabiliter, *ib.* 4126, 5406.
etc. Cf. *ib.* p. 779 for list.

3. *-icius*[1].

e.g. concinnaticius, Ap. *Met.* II. 11.
insiticius, *ib.* VI. 31.
But cf. cathedralicius, Mart. X. 13. 1.
aedilicius, Vell. Pat. II. 26. 2.
tribunicius, *pass.*

[1] E. Lattes, "Etruskische Analogieen zu lateinischen Africismen" in *Archiv* VIII. pp. 495—499.

and inscriptions *pass.*:

e.g. centuviralicius, III. 1480.
praetoricius, VI. 1388.

Cf. nouns in *-icium*, e.g. *gustaticium*, IV. 5589.

Kübler admits that this suffix is specially prevalent in Africa, and Pirson finds it rare in Gaul (though cf. XII. 3179 *missicius*); on the other hand it is not one of those selected by Hildebrand as favoured by Apuleius, and Lattes finds it, and various other so-called Africanisms, common in Etruria[1]: "Zu der im afrikanischen Latein von Mommsen Ephem. epigr. IV. 520—524 nachgewiesenen Vorliebe für Eigennamen auf *-osus, -ica, -itta*, und ebenso zu der von Bernh. Kübler in *Archiv* VIII. 169, 201, angedeuteten Bevorzugung der Adjectiven auf *-alis* und *-icius* bieten die etruskischen Inschriften zahlreiche und bemerkenswerte Parallelen[1]."

4. *-alis.*

e.g. aeternalis, Tert. *adv. Jud.* 6, inscr. 8431, etc. But cf. XI. 3969 (Capena), XII. 810 (Arelate).

Orelli, 4518 (Puteoli), 200 (Glani Livii = St Remy), etc.

carnalis, Tert. *adv. Jud.* 6.

contubernalis, inscr. *pass.*; cf. Cic. *Cael.* 30. 73, etc.

corporalis, cf. Sen. *Ep.* 53. 6, 78. 22, etc.

meridialis, Gell. II. 22. 14, Tert. *Anim.* 25. But cf. Ammian. XII. 15.

occidentalis, Gell. II. 22. 22. But cf. Plin. *N. H.* XVIII. 34, 77, § 338.

This suffix also Kübler finds specially common in Africa; but cf. Lattes, *sup. cit.*

[1] E. Lattes, "Etruskische Analogieen zu lateinischen Africismen" in *Archiv, ib.* p. 495.

5. *-arius.*

e.g. argentarius, Ap. *Met.* IV. 8. But cf. Plaut., Ter., Liv., etc.

ducenarius, Ap. *Met.* VII. 6. But cf. Plin. *N. H.* VII. 20. 19, § 83, etc.

imaginarius, Ap. *Apol.* 76. But cf. Liv. III. 41. 1, Sen. *Ep.* 20. 13, etc.

collegiarius, Tert. *Spect.* 11.

ridicularius, Gell. IV. 20. 3. But cf. Plaut. *Asin.* 330, *Trin.* 66, etc.

vulgarius, Gell. I. 22. 2, etc., Ap. *Apol.* 12. But cf. Nov. Turpil. and Afran. *ap.* Non. VIII. pp. 784, 5.

venaliciarius, Tert. *Nat.* I. 16. But cf. *C. I. L.* XII. 3349 (Gall. Cis.).

Cf. also temerarius, Plaut., Cic., Liv., etc.
praesentarius, Plaut. *Most.* 361, *Poen.* 705.
actarius, *C. I. L.* VII. 103 (Britain).

Cf. also nouns in *-arium.*

e.g. capitularium, II. 5181. 12.
ponderarium, V. 6771.
ossuarium, 9432, cf. X. 6368 and XIV. 1473 (Ostia).

Cf. Orelli, 4544 (Rome), 4784 (ager Romanus), etc.

Pirson[1] finds this suffix exceedingly common in Gaul, and cites 38 examples of adjectives in *-arius* from *C.I.L.* XII.

e.g. ampullarius, *ib.* 4455.
annularius, *ib.* 4456.
armariarius, *ib.* 4463, etc.

The suffix is apparently vulgar, for it is not found in Old Latin tragedy, and is much rarer in Terence than in Plautus[2].

[1] Cf. Pirson, *op. cit.* pp. 227 f.
[2] Cf. P. Wahrmann, *op. cit.* pp. 82, 83.

6. *-osus*[1].

On this termination *vid.* Gell. IV. 9. 12.

e.g. laciniosus, Ap. *Apol.* 21. But cf. Plin. *N. H.* V. 10. 11, § 62.

formidulosus, Ap. *Met.* XI. 16. But cf. Plaut., Cic., Tac., etc.

hircuosus, Ap. *Met.* V. 25.

luxuriosus, *ib.* V. 25. But cf. Cic. *Or.* 24. 81, Col. V. 6. 36, etc.

silentiosus, Ap. *Met.* XI. 1.

facinerosus, *ib.* III. 26, etc. But cf. Cic. *de Or.* II. 58. 237, etc.

febriculosus, Gell. XX. 1. 27. But cf. Catull. 6. 4.

terrosus, Cass. Fel. 49. 17. But cf. Vitruv. II. 4.

Cf. also morbosus, Cato, Varro, Catull., etc.

lacrimosus, Hor., Ovid, Plin., etc.

formosus, Cic., Ovid, Plin., etc.

The termination is a favourite one with Livy, and is common in Celsus, Columella and Pliny.

Cf. articulosus, calculosus, callosus, carnosus, glandulosus, etc.[2] Pirson denies that it is especially African and maintains that it is by no means rare in Gaul[3]:

e.g. contumeliosus, XII. 2361 (469).
iniuriosus, *ib.* 2118, etc.

(ii) *Substantives* in

1. *-tor.*

e.g. negotiator, operator, aedificator, destructor, interpolator, integrator, furator, Tert. *Apol.* 46 fin.

[1] For proper names in *-osus vid. inf.*

[2] For a list of 13 such adjectives cf. Wölfflin, "Uber die Lateinität des Cassius Felix" in *Sitzungsb. d. k. k. Akad. d. Wiss.* 1880, pp. 381 ff.

[3] Pirson, *op. cit.* p. 221.

lector, locutor, Ap. *Met.* I. 1.
incitator, Fr. 146, precator, *ib.* 192.
dispunctor, Tert. *adv. Marc.* IV. 17.
pollicitator, *ib. adv. Jud.* 1.
(But cf. pollicitor, Plaut. etc.)
quadruplator, Ap. *Apol.* 89.

But this most natural of terminations is very frequent upon non-African inscriptions, especially at Pompeii:

cf. IV. 3376, adnitor; 1658, amator; 3782, cacator; 6823, coctor; cf. 2437, 4008, 4239, 2483, 1708, etc.
Cf. also quaglator, XIV. 25 (Latium).
adventor, XIV. 2978 and 2979.
educator, XIV. 3845, IX. 5074, 5075, etc.
nutritor, XIV. 2540, etc., IX. 1090, X. 189, etc.
and structor, Petron. 35.
dominator, Cic. *de nat. Deor.* II. 2.
venditator, Gell. V. 14. 3, Tac. *Hist.* I. 49.
dispensator, Tac. *Hist.* I. 49.
dissimulator, Quint. II. 2. 5, Hor. *Ep.* I. 9. 9, etc.

and for new concretes in *-tor* as a feature of Livy's prose cf. L. Kühnast, *Die Hauptpunkte der livianischen Syntax*, Berlin, 1872, p. 336.

The suffix is only specially common in the African authors because they first sanctioned the entry into literary Latin of the many nouns in *-tor* which must have already existed in the common speech.

2. *-trix.*

e.g. amatrix, Ap. *Apol.* 78.
circumspectatrix, *ib.* 76.
ostentatrix, *ib.* 76.
modulatrix, Arnob. IV. 25.
nutrix, Tert. *ad Nat.* I. 16, etc.

But cf. *C. I. L.* XIV. 486 (Latium); IV. 3796 (Pompeii); IX. 226, etc.,

and Varro *r. r.* II. 4. 10, Plaut., Cic., Hor., Juv., etc.

fellatrix, IV. 4192.

3. *-men.*

e.g. formidamen, Ap. *Apol.* 64.

sepimen, *ib. Flor.* I.

But cf. munimen, Cassiod. *Var.* VII. 7, IX. 8.

solamina, (= provisions), found only at Hispalis (II. 1180) and Maktar (VIII. 169)[1].

stamina, III. 2183, etc.

4. *mentum*[2].

e.g. stabilamentum, Vulg. Sap. 6. 26.

But cf. Plaut. *Curc.* 367, Plin. XI. 7. 6 § 16, Val. Max. 7. 6 (cf. *ib.* firmamentum, supplementum, instrumentum).

supplicamentum, Ap. *Met.* XI. 22.

tegumentum, *ib.* VIII. 5, cf. Cic., Liv., Sen., etc.

dissimulamentum, Ap. *Apol.* 87, *Flor.* 3, p. 148.

adiumentum, Ap. *Apol.* 77.

But cf. Ter. *Phorm.* 105, Sall. *Iug.* 45. 2, etc.

auctoramentum, Ap. *Apol.* 3.

deliramentum, Fr. 32, Ap. *Apol.* 29.

But cf. Plaut. *Amph.* 696, Plin. *N. H.* II. 7. 5 § 17.

antecamenta, Ap. *Met.* XI. 9.

In Kübler's list of substantives in *-mentum* on African inscriptions, all those except atramentum (9513) are ordinary words.

[1] Cited by Olcott (*op. cit.* p. xxi) as indicating a connection between Spain and Africa.

[2] According to L. Dalmassi (*Riv. di fil.* 37, 1909, pp. 1—37, *L'arcaisme nell' Octavius di Minucio Felice*) this suffix is archaic.

Cf. also alimenta, IX. 5825, etc.
medicamentum, Col. XII. 28. 3.
eiectamentum, Tac. *Germ.* 45, etc. etc.

5. *-monium.*

e.g. castimonium, Ap. *Met.* XI. 19.
alimonia, *ib.* VI. 4.
But cf. mercimonium, Plaut. *Amph.* prol. 1, etc.
gaudimonium, Petron. 61.
tristimonium, *ib.* 63.
patrimonium, Cic. *pass.*, Juv. XIV. 116, etc.

6. *-tio.*

e.g. fascinatio, Gell. IX. 4. 8, Vulg. *Sap.* 4. 12. But cf. Plin. *N. H.* XXVIII. 4. 35.
punitio, Gell. VII. 14. 4, Vulg. *Sap.* 19. 4. But cf. Val. Max. VIII. 1. 1.
afflictio, Vulg. *Sap.* 3. 2 (= κάκωσις). But cf. Sen. *ad Helv.* 17. 5.
stabulatio, Gell. XVI. 5. 10. But. cf. Col. VI. 3. 1.
attentio, Vulg. *Sap.* 12. 20. But cf. Cic. *de Orat.* II. 35. 150.
famulitio, Ap. *Met.* II. 2.
detestatio, Ap. *Met.* VII. 23. But cf. Hor. *Epod.* V. 39, Liv. X. 38. 12.
ampliatio, Tert. *Bap.* 13. But cf. Sen. *Cont.* I. 3 fin.

Cf. also propositio, expositio, Quint. IV. 1. 34.
cogitatio, Cic. *de Orat.* II. 35. 150, etc., etc.

Abstracts in *-tio* are especially common in Cyprian[1].

[1] Cf. Watson, *op. cit.* pp. 300 ff.

7. *in-* privative[1].

Many substantives with *in-* privative occur in archaic Latin.

Cf. imbalnities, Lucil. XXVI. (24), *ap.* Non. II. p. 182.
intemperies, Gell. I. 23. 11, etc. But cf. Plaut. *Capt.* 911, Liv. VIII. 18. 1, III. 31. 1. Cic. *ad Att.* IV. 6. 3.
ingratiis, or ingratis, Ap. *Met.* II. 20. But cf. Plaut. *Merc.* 479, *ib. Mil. Glor.* 748, Ter. *Eun.* 220, etc.
iniussu, Cic. *de Sen.* 20. 73, Liv. II. 43. 9.

Many also occur in Classical and Silver Latin, but the only new Silver Latin compound is *inquies*; cf. Plin. *N. H.* XIV. 28 § 142; Gell. XIX. 9. 5; Tert. *de anim.* 25. The prefix became popular again with Tertullian, Gellius, Cyprian, and especially Apuleius; but it is so natural and so necessary that no doubt many of the compounds which appear first in literature in these writers were already prevalent in common speech and were merely excluded from the written language because they happened to have no *auctoritas*. Of the seventeen such compounds with *-in* in Gellius, thirteen are formed from common adjectives, and the others are *infortunitas, intemperiae* (cf. *intemperies sup.*), *innotitia* and *inquies* (*v. sup.*).

(iii) *Proper names* in

1. *-osus*[2].

e.g. Aelia Aeliosa,	inscr. 9151.
Flaviosa,	4276, etc., etc.

[1] Cf. Wölfflin in *Archiv* IV. pp. 400 ff. Some of these are *Graecisms*, *vid. sup.*

[2] *Vid. sup.* on *-osus* as an adjectival termination.

But *-osus* forms appear also in Gaul[1] (cf. *Veneriosa* XII. 2149, etc.), and in Etruria[2].

2. *-ica, icus.* Cf. index to *C. I. L.* VIII. *pass.*

e. g. Colonica, 1695.

This suffix is probably Greek in origin (*v. sup.*). It is especially common in Spain, *-ico* being the Spanish diminutive termination. For Spanish names in *-icus, -ica,* cf.

C. I. L. II. index.

e.g. Gallica,	6314.
Garonicus,	4490.
Pannicus,	3642.
Zoticus,	1157.
Urbica,	3966.
Harmonicus,	4374.

Cf. Ammonicus, Assalica, Caelicus, Caturicus, Pagusicus, etc.

3. *-itta* (*-ita, -uta*).

e.g. Bonitta,	2906.
Pollitta,	4963, cf. 437, 5244.
Credduta,	1700.

But Pirson[3] finds this suffix in Gaul. Cf. *Nonnita,* Ed. Le Blaut (*Ins. chrét. de la Gaule,* Paris 1856–1865), 273, 278. (Cf. *Nonnitus, ib.* 326.)

Julianeta, *ib.* 569, etc.

[1] Cf. Pirson, *op. cit.* p. 222.
[2] Cf. Lattes, *sup. cit.*
[3] Pirson, *op. cit.* p. 225.

(iv) *Verbals* in

1. *-sco* (inchoative).

e.g. persentisco, Ap. *Flor.* 12. But cf. Plaut. *Amph.* 527, Ter. *Heaut.* 916.

tabesco, liquesco, Fr. p. 232. But cf. Cic., Cato, Liv., Plin., etc.

inolesco, Gell. XII. 5. 7. But cf. Col. IV. 29. 14, Verg. *Aen.* VI. 738, etc.

innotesco, Tert. *adv. Marc.* IV. 31. But cf. Plin. *N. H.* XXXV. 11. 40 § 140, Liv. XXII. 61. 4, etc.

depudesco, Ap. *Met.* X. 29.

But verbals in *-sco* are found right through Latin literature, and are specially common in Vitruvius and Columella.

Cf. mollesco,	Lucr. V. 104, Plin. *N. H.* XII. 17. 37 § 76.
edormisco,	Plaut. *Amph.* 697, *Rud.* 586.
condormisco,	Plaut. *Mil. Glor.* 826.
obdormisco,	Petron. 86.
siccesco,	Vitruv. II. 5. 3, II. 10. 1, II. 4. 3, Col. XII. 28. 1.
liquesco,	Col. XII. 28. 3.
inaresco,	Vitruv. II. 4. 3, Col. IV. 24. 3.
subaresco,	Vitruv. VII. 3. 5.
defloresco,	Col. IV. 21. 2.
solidesco,	Col. IV. 21. 2, Vitruv. II. 6. 1.

Many of these have altogether lost their inchoative sense; but the loss of this sense, like that of the specific sense of frequentatives (*vid. inf.*), diminutives, the degrees of comparison, etc., is a characteristic feature of Latin in its stages of decay, when words were used up more quickly and their precise shades of meaning neglected.

2. *-are.*

This suffix is found especially in *frequentatives*, which, like inchoatives, have often lost their specific meaning.

e.g. curitare, Ap. *Met.* VII. 14.
esitare, *ib.* I. 19, etc.
frequentare, Cass. Fel. 169. 16.

But these frequentatives occur also in archaic Latin, e.g. Plaut. *Most.* 116, mantavit, etc.; and they are very common in Petronius:

e.g. venditare, Petr. 13,
adiutare, *ib.* 62,
dictare, *ib.* 45,

where they are not used in strictly frequentative sense.

Wölfflin[1] claims that the Africans use *-are* as an intransitive suffix to a greater extent than the earlier authors. As other verbals in *-are* claimed as Africanisms we may note:

incursare, Ap. *Met.* VII. 17.

ventilare, Tert. *Scorp.* 7, Min. Fel. 28. 2. Cf. Fr. 68, eventilari.

inducare, Vulg. Matth. 24. 41.

improperare (= to reproach)—often in Biblical Latin; e.g. Vulg. Rom. 15. 3. But cf. Petron. 38.

depalare, Tert. *Apol.* 10, inscr. 2728.

But cf. Orelli, 3688 (Soracte), 3689 (Porta Nomentana: *depalatio*), Rom. inscr. Fabr. 833.

exaltare, 2630. Cf. Vulg. Ps. 56. 5, and *pass.*

But cf. inscr. Fabr. p. 784; and Sen. *Q. N.* III. proem: deus alia exaltat, alia summittit (vv. ll. extruit, extruxit).

[1] Wölfflin in *Archiv* IV. pp. 197 ff.

explicare (= to set free), 2593. But cf. Cic. *de Imp. Pomp.* II. 30.

exsuperare (= to remain over), 5863. But cf. Val. Max. V. 9. 4.

innovare, 8809, etc., Min. Fel. 11, Lact. *Inst.* VII. 22, med. But cf. Cic. *in Pis.* 36. 89.

cambiare, Ap. *Apol.* 17. But cf. French changer.

minare, Vulg. Exod. 3. 1. But cf. French mener.

These last two, and others which have left survivals in Romance languages, cannot have been peculiar to African Latin, which left no Romance language to survive it[1].

Verbals in *-izare*, e.g. christianizare, Tert. *adv. Marc.* I. 21, allegorizare, Tert. *de res carn.* 27 and 30, are Graecisms. Cf. *-ιζειν.*

3. *Verbs formed from superlatives*[2].

e.g. infimare, Ap. *Met.* I. 8.
postumare, Tert. *Apol.* 19.
ultimare, Tert. *de Pall.* I.
proximare, Ap. *Met.* II. 32, etc.; Vulg. Heb. 7. 19.
consummare, used by the Africans in preference to perficere: e.g. Vict. Vit. III. 24, etc.

But cf. Liv. XXIX. 23. 4, Col. IX. 13. 11, Quint. II. 66, etc.

Cf. also Orelli 511 (Athens), 2279 (Tusculum), and intimare, Ennod. 34. 26, etc.

Cf. also *Substantives formed from Superlatives.*

e.g. consummatio, Col., Plin., Quint., Sen., etc.
summatio, Lucr. V. 1140.
infimatio, Plaut. *Stich.* 493, etc.

[1] *Vid. inf.* p. 248.

[2] Cf. Wölfflin in *Archiv* II. pp. 355 ff.

4. *Infinitives in -ier and imperfects in -ibam.*

Cf. Gell. XV. 2. 1: viderier gestibat (in imitation of the archaic forms); Arnob. V. 29: velarier et coronarier. Cf. *ib.* III. 35, VII. 25, 46, etc.

These archaisms have been claimed as Africanisms, but they are too familiar to require further comment.

Cf. Plaut. *Asin.* 315, gestibant.

Ter. *Phorm.* 652, venibat, etc.

The distinction between archaism and Africanism cannot be insisted upon too strongly.

As regards *vocabulary*, apart from the question of word-formation, Kübler insists with justice that we need far more comparison with the inscriptions of other countries. He gives a list of words and phrases especially frequent in African inscriptions, but these, many of which are by no means peculiar to the Africans, form but a very small proportion of the whole. Many, too, are due to the exigencies of the theological vocabulary. Ecclesiastical Latin was born in Africa, and its words and terms are naturally found in great abundance in the writings of the great pillars of the African Church. It is not for that reason a dialect form of Latin, any more than was the philosophical or rhetorical vocabulary which Cicero fashioned. Also, many words claimed as African and hitherto not found outside Africa or African writers have left survivals in the Romance tongues, and, as Latin was ousted from Africa by Berber before the evolution from Vulgar Latin of those Romance languages, these words could not have been perpetuated unless they had occurred in the Vulgar Latin of some other country, in which a Romance language grew up.

A few of the chief "Africanisms" deserve brief consideration, for it is noteworthy that many of them are found in non-African authors or inscriptions. Standard works on the vocabularies of the various African authors are noted in the *Bibliography*.

absque = sine (archaic).

e.g. Gell. II. 2. 7, Min. Fel. 24. 3, Ap. *Apol.* 55, etc.; it is not found in Arnob. or Cyp. But cf. Ter. *Phorm.* 188, Plaut. *Trin.* 1127, Cic. *Att.* I. 19. 1 (to avoid *sino sine*), Quint. VII. 2. 44. It does not occur on African inscriptions, although it might often have been used;

e.g. 152, nulla spes vivendi mihi sine coniuge tali.

Cf. 2207, 9050, etc.

But cf. IX. 4763. 6 (Forum Novum). Vixit absque ulla querela, Orelli 4040 (Tergeste).

alogia (Greek).

e.g. Aug. *Ep.* 86. But cf. Petron. 58, Sen. *Mort. Claud.* 7.

advivere. (Kalb cites this as characteristic of Scaevola.) First used in prose by Tert. Cf. Vulg. Josh. 4. 14, etc., inscr. 560; but cf. Orelli 3094, *C. I. L.* V. 4057 (Mantua), X. 2496 (Puteoli), IX. 4782, etc.

Cf. Stat. *Theb.* XII. 424.

censeo = appello.

e.g. Ap. *Met.* V. 26, Arnob. I. 3.

compedire, compeditus, e.g. Aug. *Ep.* 39, etc. But cf. Plaut. *Capt.* 944, Sen. *Tranq.* 10. 1, Petron. 39.

competens (= magnus), cf. Ap. *Apol.* 36, etc., Cyp. 573. 26, inscr. 27. Cf. sufficiens, E. 563.

constitutus = *ὠόν*[1].

[1] Cf. Landgraf in *Archiv* IX. p. 560, on this use in Porphyrio; Kalb, *op. cit.* p. 98; Wölfflin in *Archiv* VII. p. 481; and L. Goetz in *Archiv* IX. pp. 307, 308.

e.g. Cyp. 592. 21, universis episcopis vel in nostra provincia vel trans mare constitutis;

Min. Fel. 32. 7, deus in caelo constitutus.

But cf. Bayard (*Le Latin de St Cyprien*, Paris, 1902, p. 327): "Le mot *constitutus*, au sens de *ὤν*, passait il n'y a pas longtemps encore pour spécifiquement africain; on l'a signalé depuis dans Solinus, et pour ma part je l'ai trouvé couramment employé dans les lettres romaines de Novatian."

Cf. also inscr. VI. 231 (Rome); and Firm. Mat. (of Syracuse), 17: ...(sol) cottidie in occasu constitutus splendorem luminis perdat.

cupa, cupula (a cinerary urn). Cf. 2110, 2192, 2193, etc.

But cf. VI. 12202, 16837.

Orelli, 4550 (Rome), etc.

depost, 9162 (depost eius morte). Cf. Vulg. *pass.*

But Pomp. Maur. (*ap.* Keil, *Gram. Lat.* p. 273. 25) condemns this combination of *de* and *post.*

Cf. also French *depuis.*

exagium, 3294. But cf. VI. 1770 (Rome).

filii = liberi, 4498, 2878, 9101, etc.; Tert. *Nat.* II. 12 (filii virili sexu); but cf. Jul. Capit. *Vit. Pii*, 1, filii mares.

florio: claimed as an Africanism by Landgraf[1]; but cf. Italian fiorire, French fleurir.

ille, as an article (cf. unus, *inf.*).

But cf. Cic. *ad Fam.* IX. 15. 2, salsiores quam illi Atticorum, Romani atque urbani sales.

impraesentiarum[2] (archaic and vulgar).

e.g. Fr. 71, Ap. *Flor.* 17, Min. Fel. 5. 1, etc.

But cf. Cato, *r.r.* 144, and rarely in Cic., Nep. and Tac.

[1] In *Archiv* IX. p. 558.

[2] Cf. Studemund, *op. cit.* p. xxxi. He refers it to the *sermo vulgaris.*

inibi (vulgar-archaic), cf. Gell. XVII. 8. 2, M. A. *ap.* Fr. 34, 60, 94, Ap. *Met.* VI. 18.

But cf. Cato, *r. r.* 18. 2, Cic. *Phil.* XIV. 2. 5, Afran., Pac., Caecil. *ap.* Non. II. p. 180, Plaut. *Pers.* 125, etc.

instinctus, 51. Gell. XVI. 17.

But cf. Liv. IX. 40. 7, Vell. Pat. I. 12, etc.

insuper habere = neglegere.

e.g. Fr. 65, Gell. I. 19. 8.

ipsus = ipse (archaic),

Fr. 84; but cf. Plaut. *Pseud.* 1142, *Trin.* 322, Ter. *And.* 495, etc., and inscr. IX. 1164 (Aeclanum).

itiner = iter (archaic), 2391.

Mart. Cap. IX. § 897 (one MS. has iner); but cf. Enn., Pac., Acc., Turpil. *ap.* Non. VIII. pp. 774, 775, Plaut. *Merc.* 929, Lucr. VI. 339, etc.

iugis (archaic).

Gell. XII. 8, Cass. Fel. 81. 9, etc. Fr. 7. Vulg. *pass.*, e.g. Prov. 15. 15, etc.

But cf. Cic. *nat. Deor.* II. 10, Plaut. *Pseud.* 841, Sall. *Iug.* 89. 6, Rut. Nam. II. 4.

Cf. iugiter (archaic).

Vulg. Ex. 29. 38, Cass. Fel. (7 times), inscr. 251, iugiter videndo, etc.

But cf. VI. 1756 (Mausoleum Probi), etc.

iugiter is quoted as an archaism by Quint. VIII. 3. 25 ff.

lavacrum, 1412, 10946. Gell. I. 2. 2, Tert. *Cor.* 3.

But cf. X. 3678 (Misenum), Spart. *Hadr.* 18, Ammian. XVI. 10. 14.

nimietas. Ap. *Met.* III. 10, Vulg. Sap. 4. 4, Tert. *adv. Herm.* 43, Arnob. IV. 17, etc.

But cf. Eutrop. X. 18.

penes = apud[1].

Cyp. 529. 12, etc. Tert. *Cult. Fem.* I. 5, Ap. *Flor.* 18, Min. Fel. 31. 4. But cf. Plaut. *Trin.* 733, *Aul.* 654, Cic. *Mil.* 22. 60, Caes. *b. Gall.* I. 76. 4, etc. penes in this sense only occurs on one (obscure) African inscription, 5378, (fun)eris penes or(dinem).

perduco = haurio.

Cf. Ap. *Met.* X. 5, Arnob. V. 26, inscr. 1097.

But cf. Scrib. *Comp.* 135 fin.

pertranseo. Vulg. Sap. 2. 8, 5. 10, Gen. 12. 6, etc.

But cf. Plin. *N. H.* XXXVII. 5. 18, § 68.

pignus (= child), 9519. E. 1310.

But cf. Ov. *Trist.* III. 11. 16, Petron. 89. 42.

podismus. E. 1296.

But cf. Orelli, 4570 (Rome).

prae manu esse (archaic), Ap. *Met.* VI. 18.

Cf. Gell. XIX. 8. 6 (prae manibus).

But cf. Plaut. *Bacch.* 623, Ter. *Ad.* 134.

promerere aliquem (archaic). M. A. *ap.* Fr. 86, Fr. 26, Ap. *Met.* XI. 6, Aug. *Civ. Dei,* I. 13, inscr. 829, etc. But cf. Stat. *Silv.* V. 1. 72, Suet. *Aug.* 3 (in promerendis sociis), Plin. *Panegy.* 62.

prosatus (with ablative).

8896 (prosata patre), Nemes. *Ecl.* 3. 63, cf. Ap. *de Mundo,* 12 (ex aere prosati), Ap. *de dogm. Plat.* 1. 1 (Plato augustiore conceptu prosatus). But cf. Orelli 4322 (Rome).

quanti = quot, 218. Tert. *Apol.* 1, and *ib.* 50, *adv. Nat.* I. 9 (p. 46), Apul. *Asclep.* 37, Lact. *Inst.* III. 19. 23, etc. Cf. Hildebrand's Apuleius, Vol. 1, p. 552, note.

[1] Cf. P. Hirt, in *Archiv* IV. pp. 389 ff.

But cf. Stat. *Silv.* IV. 3. 49 (o quantae pariter manus laborant); and Ennod. 1. 8, 12. 18, etc.

quisque = quisquis (archaic).

Flor. 7, Cyp. 10. 11, Min. Fel. 13. 1, Ap. *Met.* II. 5, VII. 9 (codd. quique: Blümner reads qui quidem), inscr. 1027, 2729. But this is cited as an archaism in Quint. VIII. 3. 25.

Cf. Plaut. *Mil. Glor.* 156, 460, *Capt.* 797, etc.

Liv. I. 24. 3 (in an old formula—codd. cuiusque; Madvig, cuius).

Sid. *Ep.* IV. 11. 16 (at tu, quisque doles, amice lector), cf. also *C. I. L.* XIV. 307, 1236, 1941, V. 8974, IV. 1937, etc.

retro = olim.

According to Teuffel this is a quasi-legal use; cf. inscr. 10304, 6308, Cyp. *App.* 64. 2 (*ad Nov.* 14), Tert. *uxor.* II. 2, *Apol.* 18; but cf. Cic. *Rep.* I. 37. 58, Hor. *Od.* III. 29. 46, Traj. *ap.* Plin. *Ep.* X. 118 (119), inscr. Orelli 1049 (Arelate).

sequior sexus, Flor. I. 4. 7 (Rossbach reads: ne qui sexus), Ap. *Met.* VII. 8, X. 23.

But for this form cf. Ammian. XVIII. 6. 6 (fortuna sequior).

sibi placere, Vulg. Sap. 6. 3, etc.

But cf. Petron. 126, Cic. *de Or.* II. 4. 15, Plin. *N. H.* XXXV. 9. 36, § 63, Juv. VI. 276, Sid. *Ep.* VII. 9.

spirita = spira.

E. 563, cf. Cato, *r. r.* 82 (spaeritam si facito ita ut spiram).

tantum...quantum = tam...quam, 2409.

But cf. Vell. Pat. II. 11. 1, quantum bello optimus tantum pace pessimus.

unicuba, univira.

Min. Fel. 24, Tert. *adv. Psych.* 8, inscr. 7537. But cf. Orelli, 2742 (Rome: univiria), 4530 (Rome: unibyria).

unus, as article, cf. French (and *vid.* ille *sup.*).

But cf. Plaut. *Most.* 666 (iterum iam ad unum saxum fluctus me ferunt), *Cap.* 482 (dico unum ridiculum verbum), *Truc.* 543, *Mil. Glor.* 24.

As regards *Orthography*, Kübler does not discuss the dropping of final consonants, as being too common to be considered characteristic of Africa in particular[1]. Bad spelling is rife in all the provinces and in Italy itself, and nothing in Africa can surpass the Pompeian "abia Venere Pompeiana iradam." The catacombs are filled with inscriptions as barbarous as anything in Africa. The form *fraglare*, for *flagrare*, which is often claimed as an Africanism, is simply a vulgarism.

e.g. Fr. 5, 27, 34, etc.

Ap. *Met.* v. 9, v. 23, etc.

Arnob. v. 1[2], v. 6[3], Cyp. 12. 2, etc.;

fraglo for *flagro* is common in MSS., and comes through the corruption *fragro*.

In reviewing the question of African *Stylistic*, Kübler finds a certain amount of evidence for the *tumor Africus*, especially in pleonasm in the use of epithets and particles,

[1] Cf. Aug. Andollent, "L'orthographie des lapicides Carthaginois," in *Rev. de Phil.* 22, 1898, pp. 213 ff. The instances which he gives of omission of final *-m* in Carthaginian inscriptions have nothing distinctive about them, nor are his examples of omission of various vowels and consonants at the beginning, middle and end of words at all indicative of a peculiar African orthography. The omission of final *-m* sometimes solves a metrical difficulty with delightful ease: e.g. 9117, "et lin(,uet dulces natos et coniuge dignu."

[2] *fragrantia*: Sab.; *flagrantia*: P.

[3] *fraglantiam*: P; *flagrantiam*: Sab.

and peculiarities in the grades of comparison. But, as we have seen, Gaul and Spain also had their pleonasms, and so long as the world lasts there will be men who habitually say more than they mean and others whose idea of style in general, and of the use of epithets in particular, is based on the supposition that quantity is to be preferred to quality.

After reviewing his conclusions Kübler adds: "Das sind kleine Thatsachen die geeignet wären die Annahme der Africitas umzustürzen." Inscriptional evidence has corroborated that of literature, indicating in the case of the spoken language what literature indicates in the case of the written—that Latin all over the Empire developed and was corrupted according to general laws, which acted everywhere in the same manner and produced everywhere similar results. The phenomenon is, of course, infinitely more strange in the case of the spoken than in that of the written language. Nevertheless, from their geographical position there was likely to be intercourse between North Africa and South Italy, Spain and Gaul. And indeed the evidence, as we possess it at present, is overwhelming. "Jusqu'ici," writes Boissier, "la publication du *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* a trompé les espérances de ceux qui s'étaient mis en quête de provincialismes[1]." Olcott,

[1] Boissier, in *Mélanges Renier*, pp. 51 ff.; cf. Schuchardt, *op. cit.* I. p. 92: "Dieses (das rustike Latein) erscheint auf Denkmälern aller Gegenden eigentlich immer als ein und dasselbe." Cf. also Max Hoffmann, *op. cit.* p. 7: "constare mihi videtur tantum abesse ut 'provincialis' linguae proprietates ex orthographia titulorum Latinorum diligentius perlustrata demonstrari possint ut communis lingua vulgaris per omnes fere omnium imperii Romani regionum titulos, quicumque linguam vulgarem exhibent, valeat per ea saecula, quibus illae scriptae sunt inscriptiones, quae recipi solent in Corpus ab Academia Berolinensi curatum."

himself a champion of *Africitas*, admits that when we come to examine the material, the result is disappointing[1]; and, when he turns to Spain, finds that "the Spanish inscriptions, beyond a strong Iberian element observable in most proper names, offer little for the study of local word-formation[2]." A theory which holds good until "we come to examine the material," and thereafter shows signs of collapse, hardly commends itself to the scientific spirit. From Gaul comes the same tale. "Je crois qu'il faut dire adieu," says Pichon, "à cette chimère des latinités provinciales. Le Latin s'altère dans tous les pays sous l'Empire, il s'altère de plus en plus à mesure qu'on s'éloigne de l'époque classique, et surtout à mesure que ceux qui le parlent sont plus dépourvus de culture intellectuelle, mais il s'altère partout de la même façon. Les seules differences qu'on puisse aperçevoir, tiennent à la chronologie ou à la hiérarchie sociale, non à la géographie...Un Latin vulgaire, à peu près identique à celui de tous les pays de l'Empire, un Latin littéraire fidèlement calqué sur celui des grands auteurs, voilà en somme ce qu'on trouve dans la Gaule romaine[3]." We have seen, too, the "Africanism" of Ennodius[4], while

[1] Olcott, *op. cit.* p. xv. [2] Olcott, *op. cit.* p. xxi.

[3] Pichon, *op. cit.* pp. 16 f. Cf. J. Pirson, *op. cit.* pp. 324 ff.: "Nous avons également étudié les inscriptions au point de vue de différences locales, mais nous sommes forcés d'avouer...que les résultats obtenus en ce point sont peu importants.... On peut se demander si les documents latins que nous possédons nous permettront jamais d'approfondir cette question. On peut en douter lorsqu'on les compare entre eux; on constate qu'une foule de particularités qu'on serait tout d'abord tenté de considérer comme spéciales à une province se retrouvent dans les textes provenants d'autres régions. D'autre part, les traits qui restent isolés dans la comparaison trahissent des altérations d'un caractère si général qu'il serait très hasardeux d'y reconnaître des différences locales."

[4] Cf. Aug. Dubois, *La Latinité d'Ennodius*, *sup. cit.*

Rönsch[1] and Praun[2] testify to the similarity which African Latin bears to that of Petronius and Vitruvius, and E. W. Watson connects Cyprian with Ammianus, the panegyrists, and with Vitruvius[3].

The fact then has been established that, contrary to expectation, African Latin was practically free from provincialism; but for this phenomenon some explanation must be found. That explanation lies in the spread of *education* and rhetoric in Africa[4]. There, as in Britain[5], it was rhetoric which won the day for Rome, and Africa, *nutricula causidicorum*[6], yielded to the rhetorician what she might never have yielded to the soldier. Carthage in particular fell under the spell. Apuleius gives a realistic picture of her zeal for culture and of the keenly critical audiences to which he spoke[7], and he has himself a

[1] Cf. Rönsch, *op. cit.* p. 7: "Was übrigens die nahe Verwandtschaft des Volksidioms von Italien mit dem afrikanischen anlangt, so zeigt sich diese in den süditalienischen Idiotismen des Petronius, die gerade zu Afrikanismen genannt werden können."

[2] Cf. Praun, *Syntax des Vitruvs*, p. 13: "Überhaupt mag hier die Bemerkung ihren Platz finden das manche stilistische Eigenheiten welche bisher nur aus späteren vulgär-Schriftstellern, namentlich den Afrikanern, belegt waren, bereits bei Vitruv sich finden."

[3] Cf. E. W. Watson, *op. cit.* p. 241, on Cyprian's style: "In its literary aspects it is closely akin to that of Ammianus and the panegyrists; in its grammatical, to that of Vitruvius."

[4] Cf. Boissier, *Rom. Af.* pp. 239 f. He adduces in proof of this spread of education the large number of epitaphs referring to the literary and rhetorical proficiency of the dead. Cf. 8500, 9182, 12152. Cf. *ib.* p. 265 and pp. 272 ff.

[5] Cf. Tac. *Agric.* 21, "...ut, qui modo linguam Romanam abnuebant, eloquentiam concupiscerent." Cf. *sup.*

[6] Cf. Juv. *Sat.* VII. 148, and XV. 111.

[7] Cf. Apul. *Florid.* 9: "quis enim vestrum mihi unum soloecismum ignoverit? quis vel unam syllabam barbare pronuntiatam donaverit? quis incondita et vitiosa verba temere quasi delirantibus oborientia permiserit blaterare?" etc.; *ib.* 20, "quae autem maior laus aut certior,

supreme contempt for a young man who had not been educated in Latin rhetoric and who only knew Punic and a smattering of Greek[1]. In addition to rhetoric poetry was also in high favour, to judge by the number of metrical (or would-be metrical) inscriptions; indeed it is somewhat remarkable that, in spite of this poetical activity, Africa produced no great poet[2].

It was the educated Africans, then, who suppressed provincialism; for the school is everywhere the enemy of *patois*[3]. The same vanity which led the conquered to assume Roman names in order to appear of the conquering

quam Carthagini benedicere, ubi tota civitas eruditissimi estis?...Carthago provinciae nostrae magistra venerabilis, Carthago Africae Musa Caelestis, Carthago Camena togatorum"; cf. Aug. *Conf.* v. 8, II. 3; Salvian. *Gub. Dei.* VII., 67, 68: "illic (i.e. at Carthage)...cuncta denique vel linguarum gymnasia vel morum." It is perhaps the consciousness of his critical audience which explains that feeling which one sometimes has in reading Apuleius, that the author is playing to the gallery and that under all the characters is Apuleius himself, trying to catch a smile or win applause for a neat turn. Cf. Kretschmann, *op. cit.* p. 31: "sive igitur dei sacerdotesque, sive latrones et bubulci loquentes inducuntur, tumide loquuntur non minus hi quam illi, et prorsus ut rhetores." Apuleius learnt Latin as a grown man and was self-taught. Cf. *Met.* I. 1: "nullo magistro praeeunte."

[1] Cf. Ap. *Apol.* 98: "loquitur numquam nisi punice et si quid a matre graecissat; enim latine neque vult neque potest." The man who wrote thus would naturally suppress Punisms in his own work.

[2] Dracontius, a remarkable figure for the fifth century A.D., is the greatest African poet (cf. Boissier, *Rom. Af.* pp. 277 ff.). The *Pervigilium Veneris* is also attributed to the African school, sometimes to Florus.

[3] Cf. Boissier, *Rom. Af.* p. 265; Dom. H. Leclercq, *L'Afrique Chrétienne*, Paris, 1904, Vol. I. pp. 100 ff. and Vol. II. ch. 1; Aug. *Conf.* I. 19; Sittl, *Jahresbericht*, 1891, p. 247: "Die einheimischen Sprachen haben also, obgleich das Punische, Iberische und Keltische Litteratur-Sprachen waren, keine Wirkung ausgeübt, weil die 'barbarismi' streng verpönt wurden"; Watson, *op. cit.* p. 241: "Africans of Roman birth did their best to retain, educated natives to assume, the characteristics, in language and otherwise, of the Italians."

race made them apt pupils of the conquerors' language. The rhetorical stamp which is everywhere manifest in the writings of the Christian Church shows how deeply Africa was imbued with rhetoric and how impossible it was for the trained rhetorician to throw off the effects of his education. The constant imitation of classical models in the school curriculum tended to preserve the classical traditions, and the educated provincial, who learnt Latin from his tutors or by travel, would naturally observe its rules more strictly than a native Roman[1]. For in learning a foreign language one learns its rules and regular constructions before one learns its exceptions, and the acquired provincial Latin would normally have less life, less idiom, than the Latin of those to whom it was their mother-tongue. Further, in addition to education, we have the constant commercial relationship between Rome and her various provinces, and the settlement of the Roman legions, all tending to the establishment of a kind of *lingua franca*, a universal language, which Pott compares to Hindustani[2].

[1] Cf. Sittl, *Was ist Vulgär-latein? sup. cit.* p. 386: "Das angeborene Sprachgefühl ist immer weitherziger als die angelernte Regel."

[2] Cf. Pott, *Roman Elem. in d. langob. Ges.* p. 162: "Wir meinen also...nicht das sogenannte klassische Latein, vielmehr die aus begreiflichen Gründen uns viel weniger bekannte niedere, ja gemeine lateinische Sprachweise, welche hauptsächlich der römische Adler auf seinen Reisenflügeln durch die halbe Welt trug, und die in den gewiss doch vielfach, namentlich später, aus sehr fremdartigen Elementen zusammengewürfelten romanischen Legionen zwischen von Hause aus nicht immer gleichsprachigen Soldaten und ausserdem in Verkehr mit Provinzialen zuvörderst vollig andere Zunge (z. B. etruskisch, gallisch, iberisch, dakisch) nach und nach gleichsam als eine Art lingua franca oder noch ähnlicher dem Urdu (wörtlich: Lagersprache), d. h. dem Hindustani in Ostindien zum ausgebreiteteren Verständigungsmittel wurde." Cf. H. Gölzer, *La Latinité de St Jerôme*, p. 20: "A mesure

We conclude, then, that "African Latin" was the Latin of an epoch rather than that of a country[1]. Owing, however, to the fact that in the second and third centuries of our era almost all the leading writers were of African birth, the plausible theory was put forward (apparently by the Humanists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries[2]), that the characteristics of Latin as written by these authors were due to national temperament, Semitic influence, and the circumstances under which Latin was taken to Africa. It was likewise claimed later that the inscriptions exhibited the same local peculiarities. The theory, however, falls through when we consider both literary and inscriptional evidence. African Latin is simply the Latin of the whole Empire at that particular stage of its development when Classicism was dying out and vulgarism forcing its way into literature. It so happened that it was in Africa that the *sermo plebeius*

que l'Empire romain recula ses limites, la langue perdit son originalité, et le jour où le monde ancien tout entier fut réuni sous la domination romaine, le jour où non seulement l'Italie, mais la Gaule, l'Espagne, et l'Afrique parlèrent et écrivèrent en latin, la langue qu'avait connue Cicéron n'exista plus. On vit paraître à sa place une sorte d'idiome universel."

[1] Cf. Kübler, *op. cit.* p. 201: "Was zu einer gewissen Periode der Entwickelung der lateinischen Sprache besonders häufig auftrat, dass verwies man in ein bestimmtes Land, weil gerade in diesem Momente fast alle Schriftsteller von Bedeutung jenem Lande entstammten." Cf. Becker, *Studia Apuleiana*, pp. 7 ff.: "Forte vero accidit ut in Africa nascerentur ii scriptores qui hodie nos illius aetatis elocutionem docent." He traces in the Africans "similitudo temporis saeculique ingenio."

[2] Cf. H. Hoppe, *Syntax und Stil des Tertullians*, Lpzg, 1830, p. 11: "Die Rhetorik dieses gelesensten Afrikaners (Apuleius) war Schuld daran, dass man seit der Zeit der Humanisten des xvi. und xvii. saec. von einem *tumor Africus*, einem 'Afrikanischen Stil' spricht oder sprach, einem Phantom das viel Unklarheit, neuerdings auch erbitterte Kämpfe hervorgerufen hat." Cf. Norden, *op. cit.* pp. 590 ff.

first stormed the citadel of the literary language[1], just as it was in Africa that archaism was reduced to a fine art, and that Greek rhetoric, and especially Asianism, found expression in the Latin tongue; but vulgarism, archaism, graecism and rhetoric are not on that account "African." Rather, as Sittl puts it, the Latin of Africa, the Latin of Gaul and the Latin of Spain are all Latin "of a similar quality, but a different number"—"ein Latein von verschiedener Nummer aber gleicher Qualität[2]."

[1] Cf. Rönsch, *op. cit.* p. 12: "Sie (i.e. the *Sermo plebeius*) wurde in Africa zuerst Schrift- und Büchersprache und errang sich dort bald eine Litteratur." Cf. J. Aymeric, *Lettres Chrétiennes*, IV. p. 255: "Où est le latin vulgaire qui soit différent du latin de l'église d'Afrique?...Le voici: cette langue commune à toutes les provinces devint d'abord, en Afrique, la langue *écrite* et la langue littéraire. A Rome, en Italie et dans les autres provinces, elle fut seulement parlée et n'eut pas de littérature. L'Afrique seule eut des Tertulliens, des Cypriens et des Augustins. Voilà pourquoi il est permis de prononcer le nom de latin africain et d'appuyer cette dénomination sur le caractère spécial de ces grands écrivains, mais non sur la langue elle-même."

[2] Sittl, *Jahresbericht*, 1891, p. 247.

SELECTED LETTERS

FROM THE CORRESPONDENCE OF FRONTO.

AD M. CAESAREM ET INVICEM.

Liber II. Ep. III. (Aurelius Caesar Frontoni.)

Sane siquid Graeci veteres tale scripserunt, viderint qui sciunt, ego, si fas est dicere, nec M. Porcium tam bene vituperantem, quam tu laudasti, usquam advorti. O si Dominus meus satis laudari posset, profecto a te satis laudatus esset! Τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον οὐ γίνεται νῦν. Facilius quis Phidian, facilius Apellen, facilius denique ipsum Demosthenen imitatus fuerit, aut ipsum Catonem, quam hoc tam effectum et elaboratum opus. Nihil ego umquam cultius, nihil antiquius, nihil conditius, nihil latinius legi. O te hominem beatum hac eloquentia praeditum! O me hominem beatum huic magistro traditum! o ἐπιχειρήματα! o τάξις! o elegantia! o lepos! o venustas! o verba! o nitor! o argutiae! o kharites! o ἄσκησις! o omnia! Ne valeam, nisi aliqua die virga in manus tibi tradenda erit, diadema circumponendum, tribunal ponendum: tum praeco omnis nos citaret: quid nos dico? omnis inquam, philologos et disertos istos: eos tu singulos virga produceres, verbis moneres. Mihi adhuc nullus metus huius monitionis erat; multa supersunt ut in ludum tuum pedem introferam. Haec cum summa festinatione ad te scribo: nam quom Domini mei ad te epistulam mitterem tam benignam, quid meis longioribus

14. *o verba, o nitor*: sic Nab.; conj. Corn. *o urbanitas*. ib. *Kharites*: Nab.; Müllerus mavult Χάριτες.

16. *tradenda erit*: ita em. Ehrent.; *tradenda erat*: Nab.

19. *produceres*: ita legerim (cf. Rouse, *op. cit.* p. 194); *perduceres*: Nab.; *percuteres*: conj. Fröhn.

(Aurelius Caesar to Fronto.)

Well, if the ancient Greeks have ever written anything like this I leave the learned to decide; for my own part, if I may dare say so, I have never come across even an invective of Cato's so superb as your panegyric. Oh, if it were possible to praise my lord as he deserves, surely you would so have praised him! In these days such perfection is not reached.

It would be easier to copy Pheidias, Apelles, aye, Demosthenes himself, or even Cato, than this work, in all its perfection and finish. Never have I read anything more exquisite, more in the good old style, more polished, more Latin. Oh happy you, to be endowed with such eloquence! Oh happy I, to be the pupil of such a master! Oh the arguments! the arrangement! the refinement! the charm! the loveliness! the words! the brilliance! the subtlety! the graces! the ornament! in fact everything! As I live you ought some day to have a rod put in your hand, a crown set upon your brow, a tribunal raised for you. Then the herald would summon us all,—why do I say "us"?—he would summon all the great scholars and orators, and you would beckon them forward one by one with your rod and give them words of advice. For myself I have no fear as yet of this advice, for there are still many reasons for my setting foot within your school. I am writing this to you in great haste. For when I am sending you so kindly a letter from my lord, what need is

litteris opus erat? Igitur vale, decus eloquentiae romanae, amicorum gloria, *μέγα πρᾶγμα*, homo iucundissime, consul amplissime, magister dulcissime.

Postea cavebis de me, praesertim in senatu, tam multa mentiri. Horribiliter scripsisti hanc orationem! O si ad singula capita caput tuum basiare possem! *ἰσχυρῶς πάντων καταπεφρόνηκας*. Hac oratione lecta frustra nos studemus, frustra laboramus, frustra nervos contendimus. Vale semper, magister dulcissime.

Ib. Ep. x. (Consuli et Magistro meo optimo.)

...Hexametros meos iucundissime petis, quos ego quoque confestim misissem, si illos mecum haberem. Nam librarius meus, quem tu nosti, Anicetum dico, cum proficiscerer, nihil meorum scribtorum mecum misit. Scit enim morbum meum, et timuit, ne si venissent in potestatem, quod soleo facerem, et in fumum dimitterem. Sane istis hexametris prope nullum periculum erat. Ut enim verum magistro meo confitear, amo illos. Ego istic noctibus studeo: nam interdiu in theatro consumitur. Itaque minus ago vespera fatigatus, luce dormitans. Feci tamen per hos dies excerpta ex libris sexaginta in quinque tomis: sed cum leges "sexaginta": inibi sunt et Novianae Atellaniolae, et Scipionis oratiunculae: ne tu numerum nimis expavescas....

11. *vespera*: ita cod. in marg.; *vespere*: Nab.
feci tamen per hos dies: ita cod.; Maius supp. *feci tamen mihi*, etc.
13. *sed cum leges "sexaginta"*: etc.: sic interpunxit Stud.; *cum voluptate* male supp. Euss.
Novianae Atellaniolae: ita em. Heind.; *Novianae* et *Atellaniolae*: cod.

there of a longer one from myself? So goodbye, glory of Roman eloquence, boast of your friends, magnifico, most delightful of men, most distinguished of consuls, sweetest of masters.

Please do be careful in future not to tell so many lies about me, especially in the Senate! A monstrous fine speech this! Oh, if I could kiss your head at every heading of it. You have made everything else seem utterly contemptible! After reading this speech it is useless for me to work and toil and strain every nerve. Farewell ever, sweetest master.

(To the Consul and my excellent Master.)

...It is simply charming of you to ask for my hexameters, and I would have sent them to you at once, if I had had them by me. The fact is that my secretary,—Anicetus, I mean,—you know the man,—did not send any of my compositions with me when I left home. For he knows my weakness and was afraid that, if I once got hold of them, I might throw them in the fire, as I usually do. As a matter of fact those particular hexameters had practically nothing to fear. For to confess the truth to my master,—I love them. I devote my nights to that pursuit, for the day is spent in the theatre. And so I accomplish little, for I am tired in the evening and sleepy in the daytime. Still during the last few days I have made five volumes of extracts from sixty books. Only when you read "sixty," remember that includes some little Atellan farces of Novius, and some short speeches of Scipio; so don't be too much alarmed at the number....

Ib. Ep. XII. (M. CAESAR MAGISTRO SUO.)

Sed quae, inquis, fabula? Ut pater meus a vineis domum se recepit, ego solito more equom inscendi, et in viam profectus sum, et paululum provectus. Deinde ibi in via sic oves multae conglobatae adstabant, ut fit locis solitariis, et canes quattuor, et duo pastores, sed nihil preterea. Tum pastor unus ad alterum pastorem, postquam plusculos equites vidit, Vide tibi istos equites, inquit, nam illi solent maximas rapinationes facere. Ubi id audivi, calcar equo subpingo, ecum in ovis inigo. Oves consternatae disperguntur: aliae alibi palantes balantesque oberrant. Pastor furcam intorquet; furca in equitem, qui me sectabatur, cadit. Nos aufugimus. Eo pacto qui metuebat, ne ovis amitteret, furcam perdidit. Fabulam existimas? res vera est. At etiam plura erant, quae de ea re scriberem, nisi iam me nuntius in balneum arcesseret. Vale, mi magister dulcissime, homo honestissime et rarissime, suavitas et caritas et voluptas mea.

5. *ut fit locis solitariis*: ita em. Corn.; *ut locis solitariis*: Heind.; *ut locus solitarius*: cod.; *ut locis solet aridis*: Kluss.; *ut locis solet arctis*: Fröhn.; *ut locis solitarius esset invius*: Nov.; *ut locis oviariis*, Hild.

10. *subpingo*: sic corr. Stud.; *subringo*: cod.; *suburgo*: Ellisius.

Ib. Ep. XIV. MAGISTRO SUO.

Tu cum sine me es, Catonem legis: at ego, quom sine te sum, causidicos in undecimam horam audio. Equidem velim istam noctem, quae sequitur, quam brevissimam esse. Tanti est minus lucubrare, ut te maturius videam.

Vale, mi magister dulcissime. Mater mea te salutat. Spiritum vix habeo, ita sum defessus.

1. *magistro suo*: Nab. ("ita codex valde perspicue"); *magistro meo*: Brak. ("valde perspicue legi potest").

(M. Caesar to his Master.)

...But what, you ask, is the story? As soon as my father returned home from the vineyards, I mounted my horse, as usual, and set out for the road, riding on a little way ahead,—when there in the road I met a flock of sheep, standing all huddled together, as they do in lonely places. There were four dogs with them and two shepherds, but that was all. Then one shepherd, seeing a number of horsemen, said to the other, "Just look there at those horsemen; for they are generally the worst robbers." Hearing this I set spurs to my horse and galloped into the heart of the flock. They scattered in a panic, straying this way and that, fleeting and bleating in various directions. A shepherd flung his crook at us, and it fell on the man who was riding behind me; while we made good our escape. And so, fearing to lose his sheep, he lost his crook. Do you think this is all fiction? It is sober truth. Why, I should write you a still longer account, only the messenger is summoning me to the bath. Goodbye, my sweetest master, most honourable and peerless of men, my sweet, my darling, my delight.

To his Master.

When I am away from you, *you* read Cato; but when you are away from me, *I* listen to lawyers until five o'clock. May this next night be as short as possible. It is worth while to do less work to-night, if only I may see you the sooner.

Farewell, sweetest master. My mother sends her greetings. I can scarcely breathe, I am so tired.

AD M. CAESAREM ET INVICEM.

Liber III. Ep. II. Aurelius Caesar Frontoni suo salutem.

Saepe te mihi dixisse scio, quaerere te quid maxime faceres gratum mihi: id tempus nunc adest; nunc amorem erga te meum augere potes, si augeri potest. Adpropinquat cognitio, in qua homines non modo orationem tuam benigne audituri, sed indignationem maligne spectaturi videntur. Neque ullum video, qui te in hac re monere audeat: nam qui minus amici sunt, malunt te inspectare inconstantius agentem; qui autem magis amici sunt, metuunt ne adversario tuo amiciores esse videantur, si te ab accusatione eius propria tua abducant: tum autem si quod tu in eam rem dictum elegantius meditatus es, per silentium dictionem auferre tibi non sustinent. Ideo sive tu me temerarium consultorem, sive audacem puerulum, sive adversario tuo benivolentiorem esse existimabis; non propterea, quod rectius esse arbitrabor, pedetemptius tibi consulam. Sed quid dixi consulam? qui id a te postulo et magnopere postulo et me, si inpetro, obligari tibi repromitto. Sed dices: quid? si lacessitus fuero, non eum simili dicto remunerabo? At ex eo tibi maiorem laudem quaeris, si nec lacessitus quicquam responderis. Verum si prior fecerit, respondenti tibi utcumque poterit ignosci: ut autem non inciperet, postulabi ab eo et impetrasse me credo. Utrumque enim vestrum pro suis quemque meritis diligo: et scio

10. *incostantius*: Nab.; *inconstantius*: em. Müllerus.
14. *ideo*: sic em. Ehrent.; *adeo*: cod.
20. *et dices*: ita cod.; *set* conj. Müllerus, ap. *Jahrbuch*, 95, p. 752.
23. *verum*: ita cod.; *verbum* conj. Ehrent.; cf. 79. 1, 65. 14 etc.

Aurelius Caesar to his Fronto.

I know that you have often told me that you want to know what you could do to please me most. The time has now come; now it is in your power to increase my love towards you, if it can be increased. A case is coming on in which it seems likely that men, while giving your speech a friendly hearing, will put a mischievous construction upon any display of anger on your part. And I can see no one who dares to give you a hint at this crisis, since those who are not your true friends prefer to see you act with a little inconsistency, while those who are, are afraid of appearing too friendly to your opponent if they urge you to waive your rights in accusing him. And then, too, they cannot endure to mar your speech by enforcing silence, in case you have evolved some specially choice phrase for the occasion. So though you may think me a rash adviser, or a bold stripling, or too friendly to your opponent, still I will not for that be more slow to give you advice which I believe to be right. But why did I say "advice," when I am demanding it of you, and demanding it boldly, promising in return to hold myself under an obligation to you, if I may have my own way? "What?" you will say; "if I have been insulted, am I not to pay him back in his own coin?" Ah, but you win greater glory by holding your peace under all his insults. Still, if he makes the first move, any answer on your part will be pardonable. But I begged him not to begin the attack, and I think I have had my way. For I love you both, each of you for your own merits and I

illum quidem in avi mei P. Calvisii domo eruditum, me autem aput te eruditum: propterea maximam curam in animo meo habeo, uti quam honestissime negotium istud odiosissimum transigatur. Opto ut consilium conprobes, nam voluntatem probabis. Ego certe minus sapienter magis scripsero, quam minus amice tacuero. Vale, mi Fronto carissime et amicissime.

1. *eruditum...eruditum*: ita cod.; *nutritum...eruditum* conj. Corn.; cf. Hor. *Ep.* II. 2. 41, Suet. *Nero*, 6.

5. *ego certe minus sapienter*: Nab.; *ego certe nihilominus sapienter*: Brak.

Ib. Ep. XVI. Domino meo.

Quod tu me putes somnum cepisse, totam paene noctem pervigilavi, mecum ipse reputans, num forte nimio amore tui remissius et clementius delictum aliquod tuum aestumarem; num tu ornatior perfectior iam in eloquentia esse debueris, sed ingenium tuum vel desidia vel indiligentia claudat. Haec mecum anxie volutans inveniebam te multum supra aetatem qua tu es, multum supra tempus quo operam his studiis dedisti, multum etiam supra opinionem meam, quamquam ego de te sperem inmodica, in eloquentia promovisse. Sed, quod mihi tum demum venit nocte media in mentem, qualem *ὑπόθεσιν* scribis! nimirum *ἐπιδεικτικήν*, qua nihil est difficilius. Cur? quia cum sint tria ferme genera *ὑποθέσεων*, *ἐπιδεικτικῶν συμβουλευτικῶν δικανικῶν*, cetera illa

5. *ornatior*: sic em. Hauptius (cf. Cic. *de orat.* 1. 44); *ordinatior*: cod.

6. *ingenium tuum...claudat*: sic em. Hauptius; *ingenio tuo*: cod.; *illudat*: conj. Kiess.; *sed ingenerata aliqua in ingenia tua*: Alanus.

8. *qua tu es*: Stud.; *quantus* et corr. *quantum*: cod.; *quanta es*: Maius et Nab.; *quantus es*: Ellisius; *quantula es*: Kluss.; *qua nunc es*: Herwerdenus; ib. *quamquam...sperem*: cf. 180. 1, 130. 21, 143. 8, 187. 21,

11. *promovisse=profecisse*; cf. 234. 23, 53. 14.

14—15. *ὑποθέσεων ⟨ἐπιδεικτικῶν συμβουλευτικῶν⟩ δικανικῶν*: ita supp. Hauptius; *ὑποθέσεων δικανικῶν*: cod.

remember that he was educated in the house of my grandfather, P. Calvisius, while I was educated under your care. And so I am exceedingly anxious that this disagreeable business should be settled as honourably as possible. I do hope that my advice will commend itself to you; my intention I am sure you will approve. I prefer to risk indiscretion by writing rather than unkindness by keeping silence.

Farewell my Fronto, dearest and best of friends.

To my Lord.

You may think I have been asleep, but the truth is that I have lain awake almost the whole night through, wondering in my own mind whether perhaps my love for you has not made me too indulgent and too lenient to your faults, and whether you ought not by this time to be better equipped and more finished in eloquence, did not laziness and carelessness cramp your genius. While I was anxiously turning these thoughts over in my mind, I began to realise that you had made progress in eloquence far beyond what might be expected from your tender years and the time during which you have devoted yourself to these pursuits,—far beyond even my hopes, extravagant as the hopes were which I entertained concerning you. But this is the thought which occurred to me at last in the middle of the night. What an argument you write! In the epideictic style, I mean, which is the most difficult of all. Why? Because though there are roughly speaking three kinds of hypothesis, epideictic, deliberative and

multo sunt proniora, multifaria, procliva, vel campestria; τὸ ἐπιδεικτικὸν in arduo situm. Denique cum aeque tres quasi formulae sint orationis, ἰσχνόν, μέσον, ἁδρόν, prope nullus in epidicticis τῷ ἰσχνῷ locus, qui est in dicis multum necessarius. Omnia ἐν τῷ ἐπιδεικτικῷ ἁδρῶς dicenda, ubique ornandum, ubique phaleris utendum; pauca τῷ μέσῳ χαρακτῆρι. Meministi autem tu plurimas lectiones, quibus usque adhuc versatus es, comoedias, atellanas, oratores veteres; quorum aut pauci aut praeter Catonem et Gracchum nemo tubam inflat; omnes autem mugiunt vel stridunt potius. Quid igitur Ennius egit, quem legisti? quid tragoediae ad versum sublimiter faciundum te iuverunt? Plerumque enim ad orationem faciendam versus, ad versificandum oratio magis adiuvat. Nunc nuper coepisti legere ornatas et pompaticas orationes: noli postulare statim eas imitari posse. Verum, ut dixi, incumbamus, conitamur: me vade, me praede, me sponsore, celeriter te in cacumine eloquentiae sistam. Dii facient, dei favebunt. Vale, Domine, καὶ ἔλπιζε καὶ εὐθύμει καὶ χρόνῳ καὶ ἐμπειρίᾳ πείθου. Matrem Dominam saluta. Quom Persarum disciplinam memorares, bene "battunt" ais.

4. *in dicis* (= δίκαις): sic em. Cross.; *in dicia*: cod.; *iudiciis*: Maius; *iudiciali*: Eksteinius; *dicanicis*: Hauptius; *in ⟨iu⟩diciariis* Nov. (ap. *Wien. Stud.* 1897; conjecerat antea ἐν δίκαις).

8. *quibus...versatus es*; cf. Quint. VII. 3. 1.

12. *versum*: ita cod.; *verbum*: Ehrent.

22. *bene "battunt" ais*: sic interpunxit Kluss; cf. 34. 14, 90. 1, vid. Brak. *op. cit.* I. pp. 12, 13.

forensic, the two last are far easier and have many possibilities; they are like going down-hill, or at any rate along level ground. But the epideictic is up-hill work. Finally, though there are similarly three modes of speech, if we may so call them, the plain, the medium and the florid, there is practically no place in the epideictic for the plain, which is absolutely essential in forensic oratory. In the epideictic style everything must be said in florid fashion, everywhere there must be ornament, everywhere one must use trappings; here and there is scope for the medium style.

Now you remember the many works to which you have hitherto devoted your attention, comedies, Atellan farces, the old orators. Few of these, indeed none except Cato and Gracchus, blow a trumpet-blast; they all bellow, or rather whistle. What effect, for instance, did the reading of Ennius produce? What help did his tragedies give you in writing magnificent verse? For verse is often a help in speech-writing, and oratory is still more of a help to writing verse. Quite recently you have begun to read ornate speeches of display; do not expect to be able to imitate them at once. But, as I said, let us set to work, let us use every effort; I will be your surety, I will go bail for you, I will pledge myself for you, that I shall soon set you on the very summit of eloquence. The gods will bring it to pass, the gods will prosper it. Farewell, my Lord; keep up your hopes and your courage, and trust in time and experience.

My greetings to your lady mother. In mentioning the Persian training you are correct in using the word "batten."

AD M. CAESAREM.

Liber IV. Ep. III. Domino meo Fronto.

Omnium artium, ut ego arbitror, imperitum et indoctum omnino esse praestat quam saemiperitum ac semidoctum. Nam qui sibi conscius est artis expertem esse, minus adtemptat, eoque minus praecipitat; diffidentia profecto audaciam prohibet. At ubi quis leviter quid cognitum pro conperto ostentat, falsa fiducia multifariam labitur. Philosophiae quoque disciplinas aiunt satius esse numquam attigisse, quam leviter et primoribus, ut dicitur, labiis delibasse; eosque provenire malitiosissimos, qui in vestibulo artis observati, prius inde averterint quam penetraverint. Tamen est in aliis artibus ubi interdum delitiscas, et peritus paulisper habeare quod nescias. In verbis vero eligendis conlocandisque ilico dilucet: nec verba dare diu quis potest, quin se ipse indicet verborum ignarum esse, eaque male probare, et temere existimare, et inscie contrectare, neque modum neque pondus verbi internosse.

Quam ob rem rari admodum veterum scriptorum in eum laborem studiumque et periculum verba industriosius quaerendi sese commisere. Oratorum post homines natos unus omnium M. Porcius eiusque frequens sectator C. Sallustius: poetarum maxime Plautus, multo maxime Q. Ennius, eumque studiose aemulatus L. Coelius, nec non Naevius, Lucretius, Accius etiam, Caecilius, Laberius

10. *labiis* Nab.; *labris*: mavult Kluss.; cf. Plaut. *Trin.* 910, Cic. *pro Cael.* xii. 28.

malitiosissimos: ita cod. *vitiosissimos*: conj. Ehrent.

15. *verba dare = decipere, fraudare*; cf. Cic. *ad Att.* xv. 16 A, etc.

diu quis: sic corr. Kluss.; *diutius*: cod.

23. *multo maxime Q. Ennius*: sic em. Stud.; cf. Brak.; *multo maximeque Ennius*: cod.; *multum optimeque*: Kluss.

Fronto—to my Lord.

In all branches of learning complete inexperience and ignorance are preferable, in my opinion, to a smattering of experience and knowledge. For a man who realises his ignorance of any branch of knowledge attempts less and is therefore less liable to a downfall; self-distrust in fact holds rashness in check. But when a man ostentatiously parades superficial acquaintance with a subject as though it were expert knowledge, his ill-founded confidence leads him into all manner of pitfalls. It is said of philosophy, too, that it is better never to have touched its doctrines at all than barely to have wetted one's lips, as the saying is; and that those who have trodden her entrance-hall, but have turned away before entering her house, turn out the worst of all. Yet after all in most arts one can find cover and enjoy for a time the reputation of being well-informed where one is really ignorant. But in the choice and arrangement of words the truth is out at once; it is impossible for a man to be so cunning in words as not to show at once that he is ignorant of words, that he is a poor critic and a rash judge, that he handles them unskilfully and does not distinguish the weight and measure of a word.

That is the reason why comparatively few of our old writers have devoted themselves to this laborious and difficult task of a painstaking search for words. Among the orators known to history Cato alone has undertaken it, and his constant imitator Sallust, among poets Plautus and pre-eminently Q. Ennius, whom L. Coelius industriously strove to rival, and to some extent also Naevius, Lucretius and Accius, Caecilius, and also Laberius. Of

quoque. Nam praeter hos, partim scriptorum animadvertas particulatim elegantis, Novium et Pomponium et id genus in verbis rusticanis et iocularibus ac ridiculariis, Attam in muliebribus, Sisennam in lasciviis, Lucilium in cuiusque artis ac negotii propriis.

Hic tu fortasse iandudum requiras, quo in numero locem M. Tullium, qui caput atque fons romanae facundiae cluet. Eum ego arbitror usquequaque verbis pulcherrimis elocutum et ante omnis alios oratores ad ea, quae ostentare vellet, ornanda magnificum fuisse. Verum is mihi videtur a quaerendis scrupulosius verbis procul afuisse vel magnitudine animi, vel fuga laboris, vel fiducia, non quaerenti etiam sibi, quae vix aliis quaerentibus subvenirent, praesto adfutura. Itaque conperisse videor, ut qui eius scripta omnia studiosissime lectitarim, cetera eum genera verborum copiosissime uberrimeque tractasse, verba propria, translata, simplicia, conposita, et quae in eius scribtis ubique dilucent, verba honesta, saepenumero etiam amoena: quom tamen in omnibus eius orationibus paucissima admodum reperias insperata adque inopinata verba, quae nonnisi cum studio atque cura atque vigilia adque multa veterum carminum memoria indagantur. Insperatum autem adque inopinatum verbum appello, quod praeter spem atque opinionem audientium aut legentium promitur: ita ut si subtrahas, adque eum qui legat quaerere ipsum iubeas, aut nullum aut non ita ad significando adcommodatum verbum aliud reperiat. Quam ob rem te magno opere conlaudo, quod ei rei curam

23. *verbum*: ita corr. Stud. et Corn.; *vero*: cod.

26, 27. *aut non ita significando adcommodatum*: ita corr. Brak.; *ut non ita* etc.: cod.; cf. Brak. *op. cit.* i. p. 15: "codex non exhibet id quod Naber dicit" (i.e. *aut non ita significandum adcommodandum*).

course in addition to these you may find individual authors choice in particular branches; for example, Novius and Pomponius and their school in words of country life or of jesting and banter, Atta in words used by women, Sisenna in love-scenes, Lucilius in words appropriate to each profession and business.

In this connection perhaps you have long been asking impatiently where I place Cicero, famous as the head and fount of Roman eloquence. I consider him to have used invariably the finest words, to have surpassed all other orators in the splendour with which he adorned everything which he wished to emphasize. But he seems to me to have held too far aloof from the minute search for words, either through the loftiness of his spirit, or because he shirked the labour, or because he was confident that the words which others barely acquired by search, would come ready to his hand unsought. And so my impression is—and I have read all his writings carefully again and again—that while he has handled most varieties of words with rare fullness and richness,—words literal and metaphorical, simple and compound, including those noble expressions (which in many cases are also beautiful) that light up his every page—yet you find in all his speeches exceedingly few of those sudden surprises of language which are only to be hunted out by care and pains and the midnight oil and a memory well-stocked with old poetry. By sudden surprises of language I mean those which come upon the hearer or reader unexpectedly or unawares, such that if they are removed and the reader is bidden to seek a word himself, he will either find none at all or at least no other so appropriate to the sense. And so I praise you highly because you devote effort and pains to this digging-out

industriamque adhibes, ut verbum ex alto eruas et ad significandum adcommodes. Verum, ut initio dixi, magnum in ea re periculum est, ne minus apte aut parum dilucide aut non satis decore, ut a semidocto, conlocetur: namque multo satius est volgaribus et usitatis quam remotis et requisitis uti, si parum significent.

6. *si parum significent*: sic em. Schopenus, quod mavult etiam Nab.; *significet*: cod.; *si paria significent*: conj. Corn.

Ib. Ep. VI. HAVE MIHI MAGISTER DULCISSIME.

Nos valemus. Ego aliquantum prodormivi propter perfrictiunculam, quae videtur sedata esse. Ergo ab undecima noctis in tertiam diei partim legi ex agricultura Catonis, partim scripsi, minus misere mehercule quam heri. Inde salutato patre meo, aqua mulsa sorbenda usque ad gulam et reiectanda fauces fovi potius quam dicerem *gargarissabi*: nam et ad Novium credo et alibi. Sed faucibus curatis abii ad patrem meum et immolanti adstiti. Deinde ad merendam itum. Quid me censes prandisse? panis tantulum, cum conchim, caepas et maenas bene praegnatis alios vorantis viderem. Deinde uvis metendis operam dedimus et consudabimus et iuvilavimus et *aliquot*, ut ait auctor, *reliquimus altipendulos vindemiae superstites*. Ab hora sexta domum redimus: paululum studui atque id ineptum. Deinde cum matercula mea supra torum sedente multum garrivi. Meus sermo hic erat: quid existimas modo meum Frontonem

11. *conchim*: ita cod.; *congim* conj. Carolus Dithey; *panis tantulum cum conchi, cum caepas*: em. Madv.

of words from the depths and applying them to your meaning. But, as I said at the beginning, the task involves this great risk, that the word may be used unsuitably, or that its meaning may not be sufficiently clear, or that the expression may be unattractive—all signs of the amateur. For it is far better to use common and ordinary words than far-fetched and out of the way terms which fail to express the true meaning....

HAIL, MY SWEETEST MASTER.

I am well. I slept on rather later than usual, because of a slight cold, which seems now to be well again. So I spent the time from five in the morning till nine partly in reading extracts from Cato's *Agriculture*, partly in writing—not so badly, I may tell you, as yesterday,—and then, after paying my respects to my father, I sipped water mixed with honey, till it reached the gullet, and then, spitting it out again, in this way rinsed my throat. I prefer the word "rinsed" to "gargled," for I believe it is found in Novius and elsewhere. However, after attending to my throat I went off to my father, and stood by his side while he offered sacrifice. Then to lunch. What do you think I ate? A mere morsel of bread, while I watched others gobbling beans, onions and sprats full of roe. After that we devoted ourselves to gathering grapes, till we were in a fine state of perspiration; we jodelled, and (in the words of the poet) "left a few high-hanging clusters, last survivers of the vintage." At twelve we returned home; I did a little work, but it was not worth much. Then I had a long chat with my dear mother, as she sat on the sofa. My conversation ran like this: "What do you think my dear Fronto is doing just now?" Then

facere? Tum illa: quid autem tu meam Gratiam? Tum ego: quid autem paserculam nostram Gratiam minusculam? Dum ea fabulamur atque altercamur, uter alterutrum vestrum magis amaret, discus crepuit, id est pater meus in balneum transisse nuntiatus est. Loti igitur in torculari cenavimus; non loti in torculari, sed loti cenavimus; et rusticos cavillantes audivimus libenter. Inde reversus, priusquam me in latus converto ut stertam, meum pensum explico et diei rationem meo suavissimo magistro reddo, quem si possem magis desiderare, libenter plusculum macerarer. Valebis mihi Fronto, ubiubi es, mellitissime, meus amor, mea voluptas. Quid mihi tecum est? amo absentem.

3. *uter alter(utr)um*: sic corr. Brak.; cf. 76. 8, Cic. *ad Att.* viii. 12, § 3; *uter alterum*: cod.

Ib. Ep. XIII. MAGISTRO MEO.

C. Aufidius animos tollit, arbitratum suum in caelum fert: negat se hominem iustiorem, ne quid immoderatius dicam, ex Umbria ullum alium Romam venisse. Quid quaeris? iudicem se quam oratorem volt laudari: cum rideo, despicit: facile esse ait oscitantem iudici assidere, ceterum quidem iudicare praeclarum opus. Haec in me. Sed tamen negotium belle se dedit. Benest; gaudeo. Tuus adventus me cum beat, tum sollicitat: cur beet, nemo quaerat; quam ob rem sollicitet, ego medius fidius fatebor tibi. Nam quod scribendum dedisti, ne paululum quidem operae ei, quamvis otiosus, dedi. Aristonis libri

8. *se dedit*: ita cod.; *expediit* (=*confecit*) conj. Corn.; cf. Cic. *ad Fam.* xiii. 26. 2.

she replied "And what do you think dear Gratia is about?" Then I in my turn: "And what do you think our little Gratia, the pet, is doing?" While we were talking and disputing in this way as to which of us loved one or other of you most, the gong sounded, which meant that my father had gone to his bath. So we dined after bathing in the press-room; I don't mean we bathed in the press-room, but that after our bath we had dinner there, pleasantly entertained by the banter of the country-folk. Then we returned, and before I turn over on my side to snore, I wind off my day's task and give an account of the day to my sweetest master; if it were possible to miss him more, I would gladly put up with a little more pining. Farewell Fronto, wherever you are, honey-sweet, my darling, my delight. What are you to me? I love you though you are far away.

To my Master.

C. Aufidius rides the high horse and exalts his own judgment to the skies; he says that a more just man than himself (to put it mildly) never came from Umbria to Rome. Would you believe it,—he prefers to win praise as a judge than as an orator?

When I smile, he waxes scornful and says it is easy to attend open-mouthed upon a judge, but that to judge is a noble work. So much for myself. So after all the business went off all right. That is good; I am glad.

I view your arrival with mingled feelings of happiness and anxiety. The ground of my happiness is known to all; the cause of my anxiety I swear I will confess to you. The fact is that I have not devoted a single thought to the task which you set me to write, although I have

me hac tempestate bene accipiunt, atque idem habent male: cum docent meliora, tum scilicet bene accipiunt; cum vero ostendunt, quantum ab his melioribus ingenium meum relictum sit, nimis quam saepe erubescit discipulus tuus sibique suscenset, quod viginti quinque natus annos nihildum bonarum opinionum et puriorum rationum animo hauserim. Itaque poenas do, irascor, tristis sum, ζηλοτυπῶ, cibo careo. His nunc ego curis devinctus obsequium scribendi cotidie in diem posterum protuli. Sed iam aliquid comminiscar; et quod orator quidam atticus Atheniensium contionem monebat, nonnumquam permittendum legibus dormire, libris Aristonis propitiatis paulisper quiescere concedam, meque ad istum histrionicum poetam totum convertam, lecteis prius oratiunculeis tullianeis. Scribam autem alterutram partem: nam eadem de re diversa tueri, numquam prosus ita dormiet Aristo, uti permittat. Vale, mi optime et honestissime magister. Domina mea te salutat.

13. *histrionicum*: sic corr. Hauptius; *histrionum*: cod. *meque ad istum pistorium poetam* (i.e. *Plautum*) conj. Bährensius.

15. *scribam autem alterutram partem*: sic Nab.; *in alterutram partem* addidit Euss.

AD M. CAESAREM.

Liber V. Ep. IX. Domino meo.

Quom te salvom et inlaesum dei praestiterunt, maximas deis gratias ago. Te certum habeo, cum tua instituta reputo, haud perturbatum: ego, quamlibet vos sapientes me inrideatis, consternatus equidem sum. Vale Domine dulcissime et deis curae esto. Dominam saluta.

had plenty of time. Just now Aristo's writings are delighting and tormenting me at the same time. When they teach virtue, of course they delight me; but when they show how far my own character falls short of those models of virtue, your pupil blushes sadly often, and is angry with himself because, at twenty-five, he has absorbed in his heart nothing as yet of good opinion and pure reason. And so I pay the penalty, I am angry and sad, I envy other men, I fast. The prisoner at present of these cares, every day I put off the task of writing till the next. But now I really will evolve something; and as a certain Athenian orator advised the Athenian assembly to allow the laws to sleep sometimes, I will propitiate the books of Aristo and suffer them to rest for a little, while I turn my whole attention to the great dramatic poet, after first reading the short speeches of Cicero. But I will write on one side or the other; for Aristo will never sleep so soundly as to allow me to plead for and against the same proposition.

Farewell, my best and most respected master. My lady sends you her greetings.

To my Lord.

I offer to the gods my grateful thanks for having kept you safe and sound. Remembering your rule of life, I am sure that you felt no uneasiness; but I, however you philosophers may laugh at me,—I was very anxious.

Farewell, sweetest Lord; may Heaven protect you. My greetings to your Lady.

Ib. Ep. XXV. DOMINO MEO.

In hortis vindemias ago : commode valeo : aegre tamen insisto dolore digitorum in sinistro pede. Pro Faustina mane cotidie deos appello : scio enim me pro tua salute optare ac praecari. Vale Domine dulcissime. Dominam saluta.

4. *scio*: ita cod.; *scis*: conj. Ellisius.

5. *Vale Domine dulcissime*: Nab. *Vale mi domine dulcissime*: Brak. (cf. *op. cit.* I. p. 20, "ita exaratum est in cod.").

Ib. Ep. XXXIII. [DOMINO MEO.]

Quaecumque mihi praecatus es, omnia in tua salute locata sunt : mihi sanitas, bona valetudo, laetitia, res prosperae meae ibi sunt, cum tu corpore, animo, rumore tam incolumi uteris, tam carus patri, tam dulcis matri, tam sanctus uxori, tam fratri bonus ac benignus. Haec sunt quae me cum hac valetudine tamen cupientem vitae faciunt. Apsque te, satis superque et aetatis et laboris et artis et gloriae, dolorum vero et aegritudinum aliquanto plus quam satis superque. Filiae meae iussu tuo osculum tuli : numquam mihi tam suavis tamque savianda visa [est]. Dominam saluta, Domine dulcissime. Vale et fer osculum matronae tuae.

2. *quaecumque mihi praecatus es, omnia in tua...*: ita legit Brak. in cod.; *praecatus es* jam conjecerat Schopenus; *quaecumque mihi prae(cari) solitus sum in tua...*: Nab.

11. *savianda*: sic em. Alanus; *saviata*: cod. et Nab.

Ib. Ep. LII. DOMINO MEO.

Decem tanta te amo. Filiam tuam vidi. Videor mihi te simul et Faustinam infantes vidisse : tantum boni ex utriusque voltu est commixtum ! Decem tanta te amo. Vale Domine dulcissime. Dominam saluta.

2. *decem*: ita cod.; em. Ebertus *decies*, et inf. line 4.

To my Lord.

I am passing the vintage season in the gardens. I am pretty well, but have difficulty in walking, owing to pain in the toes of my left foot. Every morning I call upon the gods on behalf of Faustina; for I know that thus I am praying and beseeching them for your own welfare. Farewell, sweetest Lord. My greetings to your Lady.

To my Lord.

All the blessings which you craved for me are bound up with your welfare; strength and health, joy and prosperity are mine when you are sound in mind and body and repute,—you who are so dear to your father, so sweet to your mother, so blameless towards your wife, so good and kind to your brother. It is this which makes me long to live in spite of my ill health. But for you I have had enough and to spare of years and toil, of art and fame,—aye, and rather more than enough and to spare of pain and sickness. I kissed my daughter for you, as you told me to do; never has she seemed to me so sweet, so kissable. My greetings to your Lady, my sweetest Lord. Farewell, and give your Lady a kiss from me.

To my Lord.

I love you ten times as much as before. I have seen your daughter. I seem to have seen you and Faustina at once as children; she combines so many good features from your two faces. I love you ten times as much as before. Farewell, sweetest Lord, my greetings to your Lady.

Ib. Ep. LIII. MAGISTRO MEO.

Et nos Gratiam, quod tui similis est, magis amamus. Facile ergo intellegimus, quanta apud te sit filiolae nostrae conciliatrix similitudo utriusque nostri: et omnino quod eam vidisti, est iucundum mihi. Vale mi optime magister.

Ib. Ep. LIX. HAVE MI MAGISTER OPTIME.

Egone ut studeam, cum tu doleas? praesertim cum mea causa doleas? non me omnibus incommodis sponte ipse adflictem? merito hercule. Quis enim tibi alius dolorem genus, quem scribis nocte proxuma auctum, quis alius eum suscitavit, nisi Centumcellae, ne me dicam? Quid igitur faciam, qui nec te video et tanto angore discrucior? Adde eo quod etiamsi libeat studere, iudicia prohibent, quae, ut dicunt qui sciunt, dies totos eximent. Misi tamen tibi hodiernam γνώμην et nudiustertianum locum communem. Heri totum diem in itinere adtrivimus: hodie difficile est, ut praeter vespertinam γνώμην quicquam agi possit. Nocte, inquis, tam longa dormis? Et dormire quidem possum, nam sum multi somni; et tantum frigoris est in cubiculo meo, ut manus vix exseri possit. Sed re vera illa res maxime mihi animum a studiis depulit, quod, dum nimium litteras amo, tibi incommodus aput Portum fui, ut res ostendit. Itaque valeant omnes Porcii et Tullii et Crispi, dum tu valeas, et te vel sine libris firmum tamen videam. Vale praecipuum meum gaudium, magister dulcissime. Domina mea te salutat. Γνώμας tres et locos communes mitte.

14. *nam sum multi somni*; ita cod.; *multisomnis* conj. Schw.
et tantum: ita corr. Kluss.; *sed*: cod.

17. *Portum*: sic cod. (i.e. Centumcellae); *Porcium*: Nab. (cf. inf. I. 18, Porcii).

To my Master.

I too love Gratia more for her likeness to you. And so I easily understand what a bond my little daughter's likeness to both her parents is in your eyes; the mere fact that you have seen her is a joy to me. Farewell, best of masters.

Hail, best of Masters.

Am I to be working while you are suffering? Especially when that suffering is on my account? Should I not rather deliberately inflict upon myself every kind of pain? By Heaven, it is what I deserve. For that pain in your knee, which you say in your letter grew worse last night, what was it which brought it on, if not—I will not say myself, —but your stay at Centumcellae? What, then, shall I do, since I cannot see you and am tortured by such pain? Added to which, even if I had the heart to work, the law courts prevent it, taking up as they do whole days,—for so say those who know. Still, I have sent you to-day's maxim and a commonplace completed three days ago.

Yesterday I spent the whole day in travelling; to-day it is difficult to get anything done except a maxim composed in the evening. You will ask, "Do you sleep so many hours at night?" Sleep, indeed, I can, for I am a great sleeper; and it is so cold in my bedroom that I can scarcely put my hand out. But the thing which really distracted me from work was that in my excessive devotion to literature I brought trouble upon you at the Gate, as events prove. And so farewell to all the Catos and Ciceros and Sallusts, if only you are well and I may yet see you strong again, even without any books. Farewell my chiefest joy, sweetest master. My Lady sends you her greetings. Send me three maxims and commonplaces.

AD ANTONINUM IMP.

Liber I. Ep. II. Antonino Augusto Fronto.

...Nam quod ad ceteras res alioqui adtinet, sat vitae est. Video te, Antonine, Principem tam egregium, quam speravi; tam iustum, tam innocentem, quam spopondi; tam gratum populo romano et acceptum, quam optavi; tam mei amantem, quam ego volui; tam disertum, quam ipse voluisti. Nam ubi primum coepisti rursum velle, nihil offuit interdum noluisse. Fieri etiam vos cotidie facundiores video et exulto quasi adhuc magister. Nam quom omnis virtutes vestras diligam et amplectar, fateor tamen praecipuum me et proprium gaudium ex eloquentia vestra capere. Itidem ut parentes cum in voltu liberum oris sui liniamenta dinoscunt, ita ego cum in orationibus vestris vestigia nostrae sectae animadverto, γέγηθε δὲ φρένα Λητώ· meis enim verbis exprimere vim gaudii mei nequeo. Nec te recordatio ista urgeat, nec omnino angat, quod tibi conscius es non perpetuam operam eloquentiae dedisse. Nam ita res habet: qui magno ingenio praeditus recta via ad eloquentiam a principio inductus atque institutus fuerit, tametsi interdum concessarit aut restiterit, ubi primum progredei denuo et pergere visum erit, coeptum illud iter confecerit setius fortasse aliquo, minus tamen nihilo. Crede autem hoc mihi omnium hominum, quos ego cognoverim, uberiore quam tu sis ingenio adfectum comperisse me neminem: quod quidem ego magna cum lite Victorini nostri et magna eius cum bile adiurare solebam, cum eum adspirare ad pulchritudinem ingenii tui posse negarem. Tum ille

7. *rursum velle*: ita cod.; *prorsum*: conj. Corn.

...For but for that I have lived long enough. I see you, Antoninus, as distinguished an Emperor as I hoped, as just and blameless as I promised, as beloved by the Roman people and as popular as I desired; your love for me comes up to my wishes, and your eloquence to your own. For as soon as you began to cherish that desire again, the fact that for a time you had ceased to cherish it proved to be no drawback. I see you both (i.e. Marcus and Verus) actually becoming more eloquent every day, and I rejoice as if I were still your master. For although I love and cherish all your virtues, yet I admit that your eloquence fills me with a special and peculiar joy. I am like parents tracing their own features in the faces of their children, when I observe in your speeches the marks of my training. "Leto was glad at heart,"—for I cannot express in my own words the depths of my joy.

You must not let yourself be troubled or harassed in the least by the remembrance and consciousness that your devotion to eloquence has not been uninterrupted. For this is the truth of the matter,—that if a man is endowed with real genius, and has from the first been guided and trained in eloquence in the right way, although at times he may relax or cease his efforts, nevertheless, as soon as he resolves to start afresh and to go on, he will complete the journey which he has begun,—by a rather less direct route perhaps, but still he will complete it. And believe me when I say this, that of all the men whom I have known I have never met one more promising than yourself,—an assertion which I used to make in hot dispute with our dear Victorinus, to his great anger, when I denied the possibility of his aspiring to the charm of

meus Rusticus romanus, qui vitam suam pro unguiculo tuo libenter dediderit atque devoverit, de ingenio tamen invitus et tristis aegre concedebat.

Unum tibi periculum fuit, Antonine, idem quod omnibus qui sublimi ingenio extiterunt, ne in verborum copia et pulchritudine clauderes: quanto enim ampliores sententiae creantur, tanto difficilius verbis vestiuntur: nec mediocriter laborandum est, ne procerae illae sententiae male sint amictae, neve indecorius cinctae, neve sint seminudae....

3. *tristis*: omittit Corn.

Ib. Ep. III. Domino meo Antonino Augusto Fronto.

Vidi pullulos tuos, quod quidem libentissime in vita mea viderim, tam simili facie tibi, ut nihil sit hoc simili similius. Feci prorsus conpendium itineris Lorium usque, conpendium viae lubricae, compendium clivorum arduorum: tamen vidi te non ex advorsum modo sed locupletius, sive me ad dexteram sive ad laevam convertissem. Sunt autem dis iuvantibus colore satis salubri, clamore forti. Panem alter tenebat bene candidum, ut puer regius, alter autem cibarium, plane ut a patre philosopho prognatus. Deos quaeso sit salvus sator, salva sint sata, salva seges sit, quae tam similes procreat. Nam etiam voculas quoque eorum audivi tam dulcis, tam venustas, ut orationis tuae lepidum illum et liquidum sonum nescio quo pacto in utriusque pipulo adgnoscerem. Iam tu igitur, nisi caves, superbiorem aliquanto me experiere; habeo enim quos pro te non oculeis modo amem, sed etiam auribus.

12. *nam etiam voculas*: sic cod.; *nativas voculas*: conj. Corn.

your natural gifts. Then that Roman Rusticus of mine, who would gladly have sacrificed his life and laid it down for your little finger, was nevertheless always reluctant and loth to admit your superior genius.

The one danger which threatened you, Antoninus, was that which has threatened all men of supreme gifts,—the danger that the flow and beauty of your language might be cramped; for the more splendid the sentiments which are conceived, the harder the task of clothing them with words. We must use every effort to secure that those lofty sentiments be not ill-clad, shabbily-girt, half-naked....

FRONTO TO MY LORD ANTONINUS AUGUSTUS.

I have seen your chicks, and it was the most delightful sight I have ever seen in my life; they are so like you that you can imagine no more perfect likeness. It really more than compensated me for the long journey to Lorium, the muddy road and the steep hills; after all I not only saw you facing me, but more than that, I saw you whether I turned to the right or to the left. By the mercy of Heaven they have quite a healthy colour, and strong lungs. One was holding a piece of white bread like a baby prince, and the other a common piece, like a true philosopher's son. I pray Heaven to preserve the sower, to preserve the seed and to preserve the ground, that it may bring forth seed thus after its own kind. For even the sound of their baby voices was so sweet and pretty that somehow in the crowing of the two babies I caught the charming and limpid sound of your speech. So, unless you take care, you will find me somewhat more uplifted than usual; for I have found some whom I can love for your sake, with ears as well as eyes.

AD ANTONINUM IMP. ET INVICEM.

Liber II. Ep. II. Domino meo Antonino Aug. Fronto.

Ne ego post homines natos et locutos omnium facundissimus habear, cum tu M. Aureli mea scripta lectitas et probas et lucrativa tua in tantis negotiis tempora meis quoque orationibus legendis occupare non inutile tibi arbitraris nec infructuosum.

Quod sive amore inductus etiam ingenio meo delectaris, beatissimus equidem sum, quod tibi tam sum carus, ut esse videar etiam disertus; sive ita censes atque ita iudicio tuo et animi sententia decernis, mihi quoque iam disertus iure videbor, quoniam videar tibi.

Quod vero patris tui laudes a me in senatu designato et inito consulatu meo dictas legisti libenter, minime miror: namque tu Parthos etiam et Hiberos sua lingua patrem tuum laudantes pro summis oratoribus audias.

Nec meam orationem, sed patris tui virtutem miratus es, nec laudatoris verba, sed laudati facta laudasti.

De tuis etiam laudibus, quas in senatu eadem illa die protuli, ita sentias velim: tunc in te eximiam indolem fuisse, nunc summam virtutem: frugem tunc in segete florentem, nunc messem perfectam et horreo conditam. Sperabam tunc, habeo nunc: spes in rem convertit....

FRONTO, TO MY LORD ANTONINUS AUGUSTUS.

Verily I shall be esteemed the most eloquent of all men who have ever spoken, since you, Marcus Aurelius, read and praise my compositions and do not think it unprofitable or unfruitful actually to spend your time—time which is invaluable for important business,—in reading my speeches. But if it is your love for me which makes you also find pleasure in my gifts, then happy am I to be so dear to you that you also think me eloquent; if this is your opinion and the decision arrived at by your judgment and your conviction, then I too shall be right in esteeming myself eloquent, since I seem so to you.

I am not at all surprised that you enjoyed reading the panegyrics which I pronounced in the Senate both as consul elect and on entering upon my consulship; for you would listen to Parthians and Spaniards praising your father in their own tongue as if they were the greatest orators. It was not my speech which you admired but your father's virtue; it was not my words of praise which you praised but the deeds of the object of my praises. As for the eulogy of yourself, too, which I pronounced on that same day in the Senate, I would have you realise that although at that time you showed wonderful natural gifts, yet now you display the very perfection of excellence; at that time the corn was waving in the field, whereas to-day the harvest is over and the corn stored in the granary. Then I hoped; now I have; hope has turned to realisation....

Ib. Ep. iv. Magistro meo Salutem.

Quamquam salubritas ruris huius me delectaret, sentiebam non mediocre illud mihi deesse, uti de tua quoque bona valetudine certus essem, mi magister. Id uti suppleas, deos ora. Rusticatio autem nostra μετὰ πολιτείας prorsus negotium illud est vitae togatae. Quid quaeris? hanc ipsam epistulam paululum me porgere non sinunt instantes curae, quarum vacacio noctis demum aliqua parte contingit. Vale, mi iucundissime magister. Ciceronis epistulas, si forte electas, totas vel dimidiatas habes, inpertias, vel mone quas potissimum legendas mihi censeas ad facultatem sermonis fovendam.

2. *quamquam*: sic em. Kluss.; *quam*: cod.; *quom*: Nab.

Ib. Ep. v. Domino meo.

Quinctus hic dies est ut correptus sum dolore membrorum omnium, praecipue autem cervicum et inguinum. Memini me excerpsisse ex Ciceronis epistulis ea dumtaxat, quibus inesset aliqua de eloquentia vel philosophia vel de rep. disputatio: praeterea siquid elegantius aut verbo notabili dictum videretur, excerpsi. Quae in usu meo ad manum erant excerpta, misi tibi. Tres libros, duos ad Brutum, unum ad Axium describi iubebis, si quid rei esse videbitur, et remittes mihi: nam exemplares eorum excerptorum nullos feci. Omnes autem Ciceronis epistulas legendas censeo, mea sententia vel magis quam omnes eius orationes. Epistulis Ciceronis nihil est perfectius.

6. *si quid elegantius*: sic corr. Schäferus; *eleganti*: cod.

10. *exemplares*: ita cod.; cf. Tac. *Hist.* iv. 25; *exemplar e. e. nullus feci*: conj. Bährensius.

12. *censeo, mea sententia*, etc.: ita interpunxit Schäferus; *censeo mea sententia, vel* etc.: Nab.

To my Master, greeting.

While revelling in this healthy country life, I realise that one important thing is wanting; I am not informed, dear master, of your good health. I pray Heaven that you may supply that want. Our country life, with all its state business, is really as busy as life in the city. Why, my pressing cares do not even suffer me to add a few lines more to this letter, and they give me no release until some hour of the night. Farewell, most delightful of masters. If you happen to have made a selection of complete letters or passages from the correspondence of Cicero, do let me have them, or else advise me as to which you think I ought preferably to read with a view to improving my powers of expression.

To my Lord.

This is the fifth day on which I have been racked with pain in every limb, especially in the neck and groin. I remember that I selected from the Letters of Cicero simply those passages which contained some discussion about eloquence or philosophy or the State; and in addition I selected any phrase which impressed me as specially choice, or any striking expression.

The extracts which I have at hand, in use, I have sent to you. Have three books copied (two to Brutus and one to Axius) if you find anything useful in them, and send them back to me; for I have made no copies of those extracts. But I think the Letters of Cicero ought *all* to be read, even more, in my opinion, than all his speeches. There is nothing more perfect than Cicero's Letters.

AD VERUM IMP. ET INVICEM.

Liber I. Ep. i. (Domino meo.)

...In poetis autem quis ignorat ut gracilis sit Lucilius, Abbucius aridus, sublimis Lucretius, mediocris Pacubius, inaequalis Accius, Ennius multiformis? Historiam quoque scribsere Sallustius structe, Pictor incondite, Claudius lepide, Antias invenuste, Seisenna longinque, verbis Cato multiiugis, Coelius singulis. Contionatur autem Cato infeste, Gracchus turbulente, Tullius copiose. Iam in iudiciis saevit idem Cato, triumphat Cicero, tumultuatur Gracchus, Calvus rixatur.

Sed haec exempla fortasse contemnas. Quid? philosophi ipsi nonne diverso genere orationis usi sunt? Zeno ad docendum planissimus, Socrates ad coarguendum captiosissimus, Diogenes ad exprobrandum promptissimus, Heraclitus obscurus involvere omnia, Pythagora mirificus clandestinis signis sancire omnia, Clitomachus anceps in dubium vocare omnia. Quidnam igitur agerent isti ipsi sapientissimi viri, si de suo quisque more atque instituto deducerentur? Socrates ne coargueret, Zeno ne disceptaret, Diogenes ne increparet, nequid Pythagora sanciret, nequid Heraclitus absconderet, nequid Clitomachus ambigeret....

3. *Abuccius*: sic em. Minton Warren; cf. Varro, *r.r.* iii. 6. 6, and iii. 2. 17 ("item L. Abuccius, ut homo, scitis, adprime doctus, cuius Luciliano charactere sunt libelli"); *Albucius*: cod. et Nab. (vid. M. Hertz, ap. *Jahrbuch* 107, 1873, pp. 338, 339).

sublimis Lucretius, *mediocris Pacuvius* etc.: ita cod.; *sublimis Lucretius*, *Terentius mediocris*, *Pacuvius uber*...conj. Minton Warren.

4. *inaequalis*: ita cod.; *aequalia* mavult Kluss.

6. *longinque*: ita cod.; *concinne* conj. Corn.

(To my Lord.)

...Among poets, as everyone knows, Lucilius is a type of the meagre, Abuccius of the dry style; Lucretius is lofty, Pacuvius neither high nor low, Accius unequal, Ennius varied. Again in history, Sallust has written in set periods, Pictor in loosely-strung clauses, Claudius with charm; Antias is ungraceful, Sisenna wearisome, Cato uses words in long teams, Coelius single words. Again, in public harangues Cato is fierce, Gracchus noisy, Cicero full; while in judicial speeches Cato storms, Cicero exults, Gracchus is vehement and Calvus quarrelsome.

But perhaps you scorn these examples. Well, did not the philosophers themselves adopt different styles of oratory? Zeno was clear in exposition, Socrates sophistical in refutation, Diogenes quick with his abuse; while Heraclitus was so dark as to obscure everything, Pythagoras had a wonderful power of ratifying everything by secret signs, and Clitomachus of making everything doubtful and uncertain.

And pray what would those same philosophers do if each were prevented from following his own accustomed line? If Socrates were forbidden to refute, Zeno to debate, Diogenes to abuse, Pythagoras to ratify, Heraclitus to conceal, Clitomachus to doubt?....

AD VERUM IMP. ET INVICEM.

Liber II. Ep. 1. Domino meo Vero Aug. Sal.

Iam iam, Imperator, esto erga me ut voles utque tuus animus feret. Vel tu me neglegito, vel etiam spernito: nihil denique honoris inpertito, *in* postremis, si videbitur, habeto. Nihil est ita durum aut ita iniurium quod me facere adversum, si maxime velis, possis, quin ego ex te gaudiis amplissimis abundem.

Virtutes tuas bellicas et militaria facinora tua atque consulta me nunc laudare tu forsitan putes. Quibus ego rebus, tametsi sunt pulcherrimae in rem publicam imperiumque populi romani optimae, amplissimae, tam iis ego rebus laetandis virilem cum ceteris portionem voluptatis capio. Ex eloquentia autem tua, quam scriptis ad senatum litteris declarasti, ego iam hic triumpho.

Recepi recepi habeoque teneoque omnem abs te cumulatam parem gratiam: possum iam de vita laeto animo excedere, magno operae meae praetio percepto, magnoque monumento ad aeternam gloriam relicto. Magistrum me tuum fuisse aut sciunt omnes homines aut opinantur aut vobis credunt. Quod equidem parcius mihimet adrogarem, nisi vos ultro praedicaretis: [id] quoniam [vos praedicatis], ego nequeo negare.

Bellicae igitur tuae laudis et adoriae multos habes administros, multaque armatorum milia undique gentium

5. *quod me facere adversum*: sic em. Kluss.; *mihi*: Maius, pro *me*; *tu*: Nab.

8. *militaria*: ita Maius etc., pro cod.: *midictaria*; conj. Alanus *Medica Parthica.*

12. *tam.* (=*tamen*) sic cod.; *tamen* mavult Nov.

16. *cumulatam parem gratiam*: ita cod.; scribit Corn. *plane*, pro *parem.*

To my Lord Verus Augustus, greeting.

Now, now, my Lord, be toward me as you will and as your spirit moves you. Slight me, yea, even scorn me. Show me no honour, hold me among the least, if you think that good. Strive as you will, there is no cruelty, no injustice which you can show me, but will make my joy in you to overflow my cup.

You may perhaps think that I am now praising your qualities as a soldier, and your deeds and counsels in war. In rejoicing over these things, glorious as they are for the State, noble and splendid as they are for the Empire of the Roman people, I do but take my one man's part of joy with all the world in these rejoicings; but here, in the eloquence which you have revealed in your despatch to the Senate, the triumph is my own. I have received back, to have and to hold, all that I ever did for you, repaid in full. I can quit life with joy, now that I have won a rich reward for my toil and left a glorious monument to eternal fame. All the world knows, or thinks, or believes your testimony that I was your master. I should be more diffident in claiming this for myself, were you not to declare it of your own accord; since you declare it, I cannot deny it.

And so you have many to help you to win praise and glory in war, and many thousands of men-at-arms, summoned from all parts of the world, support you in the

accita victoriam tibi adnituntur et adiubant: eloquentiae virtus ausim dicere meo ductu, Caesar, meoque auspicio parta est....

Igitur si verum imperatorem generis humani quaeritis, eloquentia vestra imperat, eloquentia mentibus dominatur: ea metum incutit, amorem conciliat, industriam excitat, inpudentiam extinguit, virtutem cohortatur, vitia comfutat, suadet, mulcet, docet, consolatur. Denique provoco audacter et condicione vetere: omittite eloquentiam et imperate; orationes in senatu habere omittite et Armeniam subigite: alii quoque duces ante vos Armeniam subegerunt: sed una, mehercules, tua epistula, una tui fratris de te tuisque virtutibus oratio nobilior ad gloriam et ad posteros celebratior erit quam plerique principum triumphi. Ventidius ille, postquam Parthos fudit fugavitque, ad victoriam suam praedicandam, orationem a G. Sallustio mutuatus est: et Nerva facta sua in senatu verbis rogaticiis commendavit. Item plerique ante parentes vestros propemodum infantes et elingues principes fuerunt, qui de rebus militiae a se gestis nihil magis loqui possent quam galeae loquuntur. Postquam resp. a magistratibus annuis ad G. Caesarem et mox ad Augustum tralata est, Caesari quidem facultatem dicendi video imperatoriam fuisse; Augustum vero saeculi residua elegantia et latinae linguae etiamtum integro lepore potius quam dicendi ubertate praeditum puto. Post Augustum nonnihil reliquiarum iam et vietarum et tabescentium Tiberio illi

1. *eloquentiae virtus ausim dicere meo ductu...parta est*: sic em. Haulerus; *eloquentia vero...nata est*: Nab.; *eloquentia tua*...etc.: Brak.

9. *condicione*: ita cod.; conj. Fröhn. *condictione.*

24. *residua elegantia*: ita conj. Nieb.; *saeculi residui eleganter et latine, linguae etiamtum integro lepore*...etc.: Nab.; *...latinae linguae etiamtum integro lepore*: Belt.; Brak. vidit in cod. *residia*, atque *etiam* scribit pro *etiamtum.*

struggle for victory; but the excellence of your eloquence, Caesar, was acquired, I might venture to say, under my guidance and under my auspices.

. . . . . .

Therefore if you seek the true ruler of the human race, it is your eloquence which rules, your eloquence which sways men's minds; that it is which inspires fear, wins love, spurs to energy, crushes shamelessness, exhorts to virtue, represses vice, persuades, soothes, instructs, consoles. In short I challenge you boldly and on the old terms; give up eloquence and rule; give up delivering speeches in the Senate and subdue Armenia; other generals before you have subdued Armenia, but I swear that a single despatch from you or your brother, a single speech by your brother about you and your virtues, will win more glorious fame and will be more renowned in after generations than many an Emperor's triumph.

Ventidius, after routing the Parthians and putting them to flight, borrowed a speech from Sallust to proclaim his victory; and Nerva laid his deeds before the Senate in borrowed words. So too, most of the Emperors before the days of our fathers were practically speechless and voiceless, so that they were no more able to give an account of their military exploits than a helmet. But after the state passed from the annual magistrates to G. Caesar, and after him to Augustus, I observe that Caesar displayed the true imperial power of speech, while Augustus was endowed, I think, with all that remained to his generation of choice expression and with the charm of the Latin tongue, as yet unimpaired, rather than with richness of language. After Augustus some relic, already withered and fading, still remained for Tiberius; but the succeeding

superfuisse. Imperatores autem deinceps ad Vespasianum usque eiusmodi omnes, ut non minus verborum puderet, quam pigeret morum et misereret facinorum.

Quod quis dicat, non enim didicerant: qur ergo imperabant? ut imperarent gestu censeo, ut histriones; aut nutu, ut muti; aut per interpretem, ut barbari.

Quis eorum oratione sua populum aut senatum adfari, quis edictum, quis epistulam suismet verbis componere potuit? Quasi phrenisi quivis implicitus esset, aliena eloquentes imperitabant: ut tibiae sine ore alieno mutae erant.

Imperium autem non potestatis tantummodo vocabulum, sed etiam orationis est. Quippe vis imperandi iubendo vetandoque exercetur. Nisi bene facta laudet, nisi perperam gesta reprehendat, nisi hortetur ad virtutem, nisi a vitiis deterreat, nomen suum deserat, et imperator frustra appelletur....

4. *qur ergo imperabant?* sic interpunxit Maius; *qur ergo imperabant*; Nab.; *ut imperarent censu*: ita Heind.; *aut imperarent*: cod.

9. *quasi phrenesi quivis implicitus esset*: sic corr. Corn.; *phrenitis morbus quibus* etc.: Nab.

Ib. Ep. III. Magistro meo.

...Ea vero quae post meam profectionem gesta sunt, ex litteris a me scribtis, a negotio cuique praepositis ducibus cognosces. Earum exemplaria Sallustius noster, nunc Fulvianus, dabit. Ego vero ut et consiliorum meorum rationes commemorare possis, meas quoque litteras, quibus quidquid gerendum esset, demonstratur, mittam tibi. Quodsi picturas quoque quasdam desideraveris, poteris a Fulviano accipere. Equidem quo magis te quasi in rem praesentem inducerem, mandavi Cassio Avidio Martioque

Emperors, as far as Vespasian, were all men whose words inspire shame, as their characters regret and their deeds pity. And if any one were to say "Of course, for they never learnt"—why, then, did they rule? They were to rule, I suppose, by gestures, like actors, or by a nod, like the dumb, or by an interpreter, like barbarians.

Which of them could address people or Senate in a speech of his own making? Which could compose an edict or a letter in his own words? They ruled by the words of others,—like men raving in delirium; they were dumb as pipes without the player's mouth. Empire is a title implying not only authority but also speech; inasmuch as the authority of Empire is exercised in command and prohibition. Unless an Emperor praise good deeds, blame ill, exhort to virtue, and deter from vice, he belies his own name and is called Emperor for nought....

To my Master.

...You will learn what has been done since I set out from despatches written by myself and by the officers in command of each operation. Our friend Sallustius, now called Fulvianus, will give you copies of these. But in order that you may be able to describe the scheme of my plans, I will let you have also my own despatches, which contain details of all that was to be done. And if you also want any sketch-plans, you will be able to obtain them from Fulvianus. In order that you might be able to see the thing going on before your eyes, I have myself given orders to Avidius Cassius and to Martius

Vero commentarios quosdam mihi facerent, quos tibi mittam, ex quib*us tu* mores hominum et sensum eorum cognosces. Quodsi me quoque voles aliquem commentarium facere, designa mihi qualem velis faciam, et ut iubes faciam. Quidvis enim subire paratus sum, dum a te res nostrae inlustrentur. Plane non contempseris et orationes ad senatum et adlocutiones nostras ad exercitum. Mittam tibi et sermones meos cum barbaris habitos. Multum haec tibi conferent.

Unam rem volo, non quidem demonstrare discipulus magistro, sed existimandam dare. Circa causas et initia belli diu commoraberis, et etiam ea quae nobis absentibus male gesta sunt. Tarde ad nostra venies. Porro necessarium puto, quanto ante meum adventum superiores Parthi fuerint, dilucere, ut quantum nos egerimus appareat. An igitur debeas, quomodo πεντηκονταετίαν Θουκυδίδης explicuit, illa omnia corripere, an vero paulo altius dicere, nec tamen ita, ut mox nostra, dispandere, ipse disspicies.

In summa meae res gestae tantae sunt, quantae sunt scilicet, quoiquoimodi sunt: tantae autem videbuntur, quantas tu eas videri voles.

2. *sensum*: ita conj. Heind.; cf. Hor. *Sat.* i. 3. 97; *censum*: Nab.
18. *altius*: ita cod.; *latius* conj. Heind.

Verus to write me some memoranda, which I will send you, to enlighten you as to the character and disposition of these men. But if you wish me also to write an account, tell me what kind of thing you want from me, and I will carry out your orders. For I am ready to submit to anything to have my deeds handed down to posterity by you. Do not altogether despise my speeches to the Senate or my harangues to the army. I will send you also the interviews which I had with barbarians. You will find all these very useful.

There is one thing—I, your pupil, am not trying to convince my master, but I do want to make you appreciate it. Dwell at great length upon the causes and beginnings of the war, and also upon all the mistakes which were made when I was not there. Do not be in a hurry to come to my part in it. Moreover, I think it is essential to make clear how favourable was the position of the Parthians before my arrival, so as to emphasize the importance of my operations. I leave it, then, for you yourself to decide whether you ought to summarize all those points, as Thucydides set forth the history of the fifty years, or to give them in rather more detail, yet without treating them as fully as you will afterwards treat my own exploits. In short you cannot make my actions, whatever their character, other than they really are; but you can make them *seem* just as great as you may choose.

Ib. Ep. IV. DOMINO MEO VERO AUGUSTO.

Quamquam me diu cum ista valetudine vivere iampridem pigeat taedeatque, tamen ubi te tanta gloria per virtutem parta reducem videro, neque incassum vixero neque invitus, quantum vitae dabitur, vivam. Vale Domine desiderantissime. Socrum et liberos vestros saluta.

2. *diu cum ista valetudine* : ita cod. ; *diu amissa valetudine* conj. Corn.

De Orationibus. (ANTONINO AUGUSTO FRONTO.)

...pauca subnectam fortasse inepta, iniqua. Nam rusus faxo magistrum me experiare. Neque ignoras omnem hanc magistrorum manum vanam propemodum et stolidam esse. Parum eloquentiae, et sapientiae nihil. Feres profecto bona venia veterem potestatem et nomen magistri me usurpantem denuo.

Fateor enim, quod res est, unam solam posse causam incidere, qua causa claudat aliquantum amor erga te meus: si eloquentiam neglegas. Neglegas tamen vero potius censeo quam prave excolas. Confusaneam eam ego eloquentiam, catachannae ritu, partim pineis nucibus Catonis, partim Senecae mollibus et febriculosis prunuleis

4. *omnem hanc magistrorum manum vanam* etc.: sic conj. Corn. etc., Nov.

omnem hanc magistrorum vanam etc.: cod.; Maius supp. *turbam*, Orellius *nationem*, Brak. *vim* (cf. Cic. *de harusp. resp.* 22, Liv. II. 5, Plaut. *Epid.* 249); pro *omnem* mavult Heind. *ordinem*, Ebertus *dominationem.*

11. *confusaneam*: ita Hauptius pro cod. *confusam*; cf. Gell. prooem. 5.

12. *pineis* : ita Haulerus cum cod. ; *igneis* : Nab. ; *ligneis* : Buttmannus ; *iligneis* : Orellius et Jahnius.

13. *febriculosis* : ita cod. ; *vermiculosis* conj. Corn. (sed vid. *pineis* sup., et cf. Plin. *N. H.* XV. 35 : pineis nucibus...singularis remedii etc.).

To my Lord Verus Augustus.

Although ill-health has long made life a burden and a weariness to me, yet, when I see you return in all the glory which your valour has won, I shall not have lived in vain, nor shall I be loth to live the span of life allotted to men. Farewell, my Lord, whom I sorely miss. Greetings to your father-in-law and to your children.

(Fronto to Antoninus Augustus.)

...I will add a few words, foolish, perhaps, and unfair; for I shall be making you take me again as your master; and you know how futile, I might almost say, and how stupid the whole tribe of masters is—not enough eloquence and no wisdom at all. I am sure you will forgive me for assuming once more my old authority and title of master. For I admit—and it is the sober truth—that only one thing can happen to mar my love for you in the least degree, and that is, of course, if you neglect eloquence. Yet after all I would rather have you neglect it than cultivate it wrongly. This miscellaneous style of eloquence, like a tree on which different buds have been grafted, here a shoot of pine-nuts of Cato, and here the soft plums of Seneca, which produce fever, ought in my opinion

insitam, subvertendam censeo radicitus, immo vero Plautinotato verbo, exradicitus. Neque ignoro copiosum sententiis et redundantem hominem esse: verum sententias eius tolutares video nusquam quadripedo concitas cursu tenere, nusquam pugnare, nusquam [ma]iestatem studere, ut Laberius ait, dictabolaria immo dicteria potius quam dicta continere.

Itane existimas graviores sententias [et eadem de re] apud Annaeum istum reperturum te quam apud Sergium? Sed non modulatas aeque; fateor: neque ita cordaces; ita est: neque ita tinnulas; non nego. Quid vero si prandium idem utriusque apponatur, at positas oleas alter digitis prendat, ad os adferat, ut manducandi ius fasque est ita dentibus subiciat; alter autem oleas suas in altum iaciat, ore aperto excipiat, exceptas, ut calculos praestigiator, primoribus labris ostentet? Ea re profecto pueri gaudeant, convivae delectentur; sed alter pudice pranderit, alter labellis gesticulatus erit.

At enim sunt quaedam in libris eius scite dicta, graviter

1. *immo vero Plautinotato verbo*: sic em. Stud.; *Plautino trato*: cod.; *irato*: Maius; *tralato*: Hertzius; cf. *translato*: Riesius, qui postea *Plautinotato* accepit: vid. *Rhein. Mus.* 27, p. 367. *farto*: Hauptius; *mutuato*: Corn.; *Plautino et rato verbo*: Bährensius; *Plautino tracto verbo*: Nov.; *Plautino utar verbo*: Jordanus; cf. *Plautino ut utar verbo*: Brak.

4. *quadripedo concitas cursu tenere*: sic Kluss.; *concito*: Nab. Corn. delet *concito*.

6. *ut Laberius ait, dictabolaria immo dicteria potius quam dicta confingere*: ita Haulerus; Nab. omittit *ait*, et *eum* post *posuit* scribit; pro *confingere* legit Nab. *continere*; Heind. et Kluss., *continuare*.

12. *appositas*: ita Schäferus, pro cod. *at positas*.

16. *gaudeant*: ita Maius; *laudent*: Nab.; *laudentur*: Mütz.; *plaudant*: Jacobsius; *ludant*: Ehrent.; *ludent*: Nov.

19. *at enim sunt quaedam in libellis eius scite dicta, gravi-*: haec verba errore typographico in fine p. 157 a Nabero exarata sunt.

to be torn up by the roots, or rather, to use the Plautine expression, "from the very roots." I am well aware that the fellow is full to overflowing of maxims, but I see that his sentences trot, without ever speeding on at full gallop, ever forcing an issue, ever aiming at grandeur; to quote Laberius, he fashions witty sallies, or perhaps I should say witticisms, rather than aphorisms.

Do you really think that you will find sentiments so much more weighty,—I mean on the same subject—in the pages of your Seneca than in Sergius? "But Sergius' sentences," you object, "are not so rhythmical." True. "Nor so lively in movement." No. "Nor so jingling." I quite admit it. But suppose the same breakfast were served up to both, and the one were to take the olives set before him in his fingers and put them to his lips, chewing them in the authorized fashion of mastication, while the other tossed his olives in the air and caught them in his open mouth, displaying them when caught on the tips of his lips, like a conjuror with counters. Of course that sort of thing would delight the boys and amuse the guests; but the one would be taking his meal decently, and the other playing the clown with his lips. "But," you may say, "his books contain some wise maxims, and

quoque nonnulla. Etiam lamminae interdum argentiolae cloacis inveniuntur; eane re cloacas purgandas redimemus?

Primum illud in isto genere dicendi vitium turpissimum, quod eandem sententiam milliens alio atque alio amictu indutam referunt. Ut histriones, quom palleolatim saltant, caudam cycni, capillum Veneris, Furiae flagellum eodem pallio demonstrant: ita isti unam eandemque sententiam multimodis faciunt, ventilant, commutant, convertunt, eadem lacinia saltitant, refricant eandem unam sententiam saepius quam puellae olfactaria et sucina.

Dicendum est de fortuna aliquid? omnis ibi Fortunas antiatis, praenestinas, respicientis, balnearum etiam Fortunas omnis cum pennis, cum roteis, cum gubernaculis reperias.

Unum exempli causa poetae prohoemium commemorabo, poetae eiusdem temporis eiusdemque nominis; fuit aeque Annaeus. Is initio carminis sui septem primis versibus nihil aliud quam *bella plus quam civilia* interpraetatus est. Numera replicet quot sententiis.

Iusque datum sceleri: Una sententia est.

In sua victrici conversum viscera: Iam haec altera est.

Cognatasque acies: Tertia haec erit.

In commune nefas: Quartam numerat.

6. *caudam cycni*: ita cod.; conj. Corn. *Glauci.*

8. *faciunt*: ita cod.; conj. Corn. *dispandunt*, postea autem *quatiunt*: cf. Plaut. *Epid.* 436; *farciunt*: Fröhn.; post *multimodis* supplet Nov. *aliam.*

9. *saltitant*: ita conj. Mütz.; cf. *saltant*: ita conj. Maius: *salutant*: Nab.; *involutant*: Orellius; *eandem laciniam volutant*: Hauptius.

10. *olfactoria et sucina*: ita em. Kluss.; *olfactoriae sucina*: Nab.

12. *balnearum etiam Fortunas omnis*: sic Nab.; Corn. mavult *balnearem*, expungitque *etiam Fortunas.*

19. *numera replicet q. s.*: ita Brak.; *nunc hoc r. q. s.*: Nab.; *audi hoc r. q. s.*: Kluss.

some which are distinctly weighty." Silver coins are sometimes found even in sewers; shall we on that account contract for the cleaning of sewers?

The first vice in that style of speaking is a very contemptible one,—that of repeating the same idea a thousand times over in a different dress. Just as actors, when they dance in a mantle, use the same mantle to represent a swan's tail, the hair of Venus or the lash of a Fury, so this school of authors presents the same thought in various ways, airs it, alters it, turns it, dances again and again in the same garment, and rubs up this same one thought more often than girls polish their scent-bottles and amber. Has something to be said about Fortune? You will find there all the aspects of the goddess,—the Fortune of Antium, the Fortune of Praeneste, Fortune looking backwards, even the Fortune of the baths, all alike with wings, wheels and rudders. I will mention by way of illustration one poetical prelude, by a poet of the same time and the same name; for he too was an Annaeus. At the beginning of his Epic, in the first seven lines, he has done nothing but develop one single idea,—"wars worse than civil." Count up how many phrases he takes to express it. "Crime let loose." That is one. "Plunged in her own flesh her victorious sword." That is the second. "Armies akin." That will make three. "To the common guilt." That makes the fourth.

Infestisque obvia signa: Accumulat quoque quintam.
Signis pares aquilas: Sexta haec Herculis aerumna.
Et pila minantia pilis: Septima: de Aiacis scuto corium.
Annaee, quis finis erit?

Aut si nullus finis nec modus servandus est, qur non addis *et similes lituos?* Addas licet *et carmina nota tubarum.* Sed et loricas et conos et enses et balteos et omnem armorum supellectilem sequere.

Apollonius autem—non enim Homeri prohoemiorum par artificium est—Apollonius inquam, qui Argonautas scripsit, quinque re... quattuor versibus narrat: *κλέα φωτῶν,* viros qui navigassent: *οἳ Πόντοιο κατὰ στόμα,* iter quo navigassent: *βασιλῆος ἐφημοσύνῃ Πελίαο,* cuius imperio navigassent: *χρύσειον μετὰ κῶας,* cui rei navigassent: *ἐΰζυγον ἤλασαν Ἀργώ,* navem qua vecti essent.

1. Cf. Lucan. *Phars.* I. 6, 7: "...in festisque obvia signis | signa, pares aquilas, et pila minantia pilis."
accumulat quoque quintam: ita Orellius; (*appel*)*lat*: Nab.
3. *septima: de Aiacis scuto corium*: cf. *Il.* VII. 222:
"ὅς οἱ ἐποίησεν σάκος αἰόλον ἑπταβόειον."
7. *conos*: ita cod.; Mähllius conj. *contos.*
8. *sequere*: ita Nab.; *exequere*: Nieb.; *suggere*: Corn. (cf. *Aen.* x. 333).
11. *quinque re...*: ita cod.; conj. Alanus *quinque res aliam ex alia aptas et connexas.*
14. ⟨*χρύσειον μετὰ κῶας, cui rei navigassent*⟩: supp. Brak.

Ep. *ad Ant. Pium* II. M. Frontoni Antoninus Caesar.

...Nihil istis sensibus validius, nihil elocutione, salva sanitate ta*men,* civilius. Neque enim hoc committam, ut te iustissima laude fraudem, dum metuo, ne insolenter

4. *laude fraudem*: ita cod.; conj. Corn. *defrudem.*

"The hostile standards met" (that brings it up to five), "eagle with eagle matched" (that makes the sixth labour of Hercules), "and Roman spear to Roman spear opposed." That makes seven,—like the seven hides of Ajax' shield. Where will you finish, Annaeus? Or, if there is to be no end, if no limit is to be observed, why not add "And clarions like," ending with "and trumpets' well-known blare"? Indeed you may as well go on to coats of mail, plumes, sword, belts, and the whole equipage of war.

Now Apollonius on the other hand (though as a writer of preludes he does not rival Homer)—Apollonius, I repeat, the author of the *Argonautica*, tells five facts in four lines, "The doughty deeds of heroes"—the men who set sail; "who through the Strait of Pontus"—the route by which they sailed; "at the bidding of King Pelias,"—by whose command they sailed; "on the quest of the Golden Fleece" —the object of their voyage; "the strong-ribbed Argo drave"—the ship which bore them.

Antoninus Caesar to M. Fronto.

...Nothing could be more weighty than the matter of your speech, nothing more gracious than its delivery, though it never exceeded the bounds of good sense. For I will not allow myself to defraud you of the praise which is your due, through fear of indecently praising my own

laudes meas laudem. Bene igitur accepisti et rectissimo opere, cui plane, seposita materia, omnis honor debetur: ceterum ad ostentandum mihi animum tuum non multum egit: nam esse te benignissimum omnium factorum et dictorum meorum conciliatorem bene noveram. Vale mi Fronto, carissime mihi.

Illa pars orationis tuae circa Faustinae meae honorem gratissime a te adsumta verior mihi quam disertior visa est. Nam ita se res habet: mallem mehercule Gyaris cum illa quam sine illa in Palatio vivere.

1. *laudes meas laudem*: ita cod.; conj. Corn. *cantem*.

Ib. VIII. Antonino Pio Augusto Fronto.

Omnem operam me dedisse, sanctissime Imp., et inpenso studio cupisse fungi proconsulari munere, res ipsa testis est. Nam et de iure sortiendi, quoad incertum fuit, disceptavi et postquam iure liberorum prior alius apparuit, eam quae mihi remansit splendidissimam provinciam pro electa habui. Post illa quae[cumque] ad instruendam provinciam adtinerent, quo facilius a me tanta negotia per amicorum copias obirentur, sedulo praeparavi. Propinquos et amicos meos, quorum fidem et integritatem cognoveram, domo accivi. Alexandriam ad familiares meos scripsi, ut Athenas festinarent, ibique me operirentur, iisque graecarum epistularum curam doctissimis viris detuli. Ex Cicilia etiam splendidos viros, quod magna mihi in ea provincia amicorum copia est, cum publice

praises. You have accepted the task nobly and carried it straight through, and, quite apart from the subject matter, all honour is due to you; although of course it made no great revelation of your feeling to me, for I knew well that you are the kindliest champion of all that I do or say. Farewell, my Fronto, my dear one.

That part of your speech in which you handled so gracefully the reputation of my Faustina impressed me for its truth still more than for its eloquence. For this is the fact of the case. I swear I would rather live with her in exile on Gyara than without her in the Palace.

Fronto to Antoninus Pius Augustus.

The facts themselves bear witness, most reverend Lord, that I used every effort and longed with all my heart to discharge the duties of a proconsul. For I maintained my right to a decision by lot, so long as there was room for uncertainty, and when it became plain that my colleague had the priority over me by right of the number of his children, I looked upon the magnificent province which remained to me as if it had been my own choice. I set about the energetic preparation of everything connected with collecting the staff for my province, in order that I might discharge my important duties more easily by the help of my friends. I summoned from home my relatives and friends, of whose good faith and uprightness I was assured. I wrote to my friends at Alexandria, asking them to hasten to Athens and wait for me there, and I referred to these eminent scholars the task of writing my Greek letters. I begged eminent men to come from Cilicia also; for I have made many friends

privatimque semper negotia Cilicum apud te defenderim, ut venirent hortatus sum. Ex Mauretania quoque virum amantissimum mihique mutuo carum Iulium Senem ad me vocavi, cuius non modo fide et diligentia, sed etiam militari industria circa quaerendos et continendos latrones adiuvarer. Haec omnia feci spe fretus, posse me victu tenui et aqua potanda malam valetudinem, qua impedior, si non omnino sedare, [cer]te ad m[aius] intervallum [eius] impetus mitigare. Ita evenit, ut solito diutius bene valerem et fortis vigerem: adeo ut etiam duas amicorum causas non minimi laboris aput te tutatus sim. Ingruit deinde tanta vis valetudinis, quae mihi ostenderet, omnem spem illam *inritam fuisse*....

8. [*cer*]*te ad m*[*aius*] *intervallum* [*eius*] *impetus*: sic Nab.; *certe ad maius intervallum acres eius impetus*: Schw.

10. *fortis*; ita cod.; *fortius* em. Kiess.

12. *spem illam*: cod. p. 331, quae sequitur, tota erasa est; *inritam fuisse* supp. Maius.

De Fer. Als. III. Domino meo Antonino Augusto.

...Agere de finibus deos claros et nobiles Vesperum et Luciferum puta: utrique demonstrationem sui quoisque limitis ostendunt: horum cognitioni interesse postulat Somnus, nam se quoisque adfinem esse negotio et adtingi iniuria ait.

Vellem autem tantum mihi vigoris aut studii adesse, quantum adfuit, cum illa olim nugalia conscribsi, laudem fumi et pulveris. Ne ego Somni laudem ex summis opibus conscripsissem.

2. *agere de finibus deos claros*: ita Maius; *duos* pro *deos* malunt Orellius et Nab.; *agere de finibus nondum dividuis claros* etc.: Brak.; cf. Plin. *N. H.* II. 99. 4 etc.

3. *quoisque*: ita Ellisius; *quisque*: Nab.; cf. inf. line 5.

in that province by constantly supporting the cases of Cilicians in your courts, both publicly and privately. From Mauretania also I summoned to my aid Julius Senex, who is passionately fond of me and to whom I too am equally devoted, in order that in hunting down and suppressing brigandage I might have the assistance not only of his loyalty and energy but also of his military activity. All this I did relying on the hope that by sparing diet and by drinking waters it might be possible, if not altogether to relieve the malady from which I suffer, at least to reduce the attacks for a longer period than usual. It so happened that I kept well and strong for an unusually long time; so much so that I actually supported the arduous suits of two friends before you. Then I had such a violent attack that I realised that all those hopes had been vain....

To my Lord Antoninus Augustus.

...Suppose that the great and famous gods, Vesper and Lucifer, are disputing about the boundaries (i.e. of day and night). Each describes his own boundary-line, and Sleep claims to take part in the inquiry, saying that he is the neighbour of each of them in business and is being unfairly treated. But I would that I had all the energy and zeal which I had in the old days when I wrote those trifles, the Panegyrics upon Smoke and Dust. Assuredly I would have put all my powers into the composition of

Nunc quoque, si tibi fabulam brevem libenti est audire, audi.

Iovem patrem ferunt, cum res humanas a primordio conderet, aevum iuge medium uno ictu percussum in duas partis undique paris diffidisse: partem alteram luce, alteram tenebris amixisse, diem noctemque appellasse noctique otium, diei negotium tradidisse. Tum somnus necdum natus erat et omnes pervigiles aetatem agebant; sed quies nocturna vigilantibus pro somno aduc erat promulgata. Paulatim deinde, ut sunt ingenia hominum inquieta et agitandi ac turbandi cupida, noctes diesque negotiis exercebant, horam otio nullam inpertibant. Tum Iovem ferunt, ubi iam iurgia et vadimonia nocturna sisti et noctes quoque comperendinari videat, cum corde suo agitasse de suis germanis fratribus unum praeficere, qui nocti atque otio hominum curaret. Neptunum multas et graves curas maritumas causatum, ne fluctus terras totas cum montibus obruerent, neve motus venti cuncta funditus percellerent, silvas et sata radicitus haurirent. Ditem quoque patrem causatum, multa opera multaque cura templa infera aegre coerceri, amnibus et paludibus et stagnis Stygiis Acheruntem aegre commoeniri; canem denique custodem apposuisse umbris territandis, quae aufugere ad superos cuperent, eique cani trinas latrandi fauces ac trinos hiatus trinasque dentium formidines addidisse.

4. *iuge*: ita conj. Kluss.; *vi*: Nab.; *ibi*: Hauptius; *aevum vitae medium*: ita Brak., ut conjecerat Heind.; *ovum medium*: Fröhn.

6. *amixisse*: ita corr. Belt. pro *amicisse*: cod.

9. *aduc* (vulg.) = *adhuc*; cf. M. Haupt. ap. *Hermes*, v. pp. 190, 191, Brak. legit *pro somno rite* (cf. 212. 16).

12. *negotiis exercebant*: ita cod.; supp. Corn. *negotiis se exercebant.*

18. *motus*: Nab.; *motu*: Brak.

a panegyric upon Sleep. Now, listen again, if you care to hear a short fable.

Men tell how Father Jupiter, when he founded the world from the beginning, struck all time with a single blow, cleaving it in twain into two parts exactly equal; the one part he clothed with light, the other with darkness, calling them Day and Night; and he assigned rest to the Night, work to the Day. At that time Sleep was not yet born, and all passed their life in wakefulness; as yet only the quiet of the night had been ordained instead of sleep for wakeful men. Then gradually, since the minds of men are restless and fain to toss and turn, they used night and day alike for business, and gave no hours at all to repose. Then the story goes that when Jupiter saw that by this time even at night there were disputes and recognizances, and that cases were formally adjourned from night to night, he debated in his mind about appointing one of his brothers to take charge of the night and of man's rest. But Neptune pleaded in excuse the many heavy cares which his charge of the sea involved, lest the waves, rising mountain-high, should flood the whole earth, or the blasts of the wind throw all things utterly into confusion, and bring dire destruction upon woods and crops. Father Dis also pleaded in excuse that it was only with great care and trouble that the regions below were kept under control and that the realms of Acheron were with difficulty defended by the rivers and meres and pools of Styx; indeed he had set a watch-dog to terrify the shades, which were fain to flee to the realms above, and to this dog he had given three throats for barking, three yawning jaws, and three rows of teeth.

Tum Iovem deos alios percontatum animadvertisse, gratiam vigiliae aliquantum pollere; Iunonem plerosque partus nocturnos ciere; Minervam artium atque artificum magistram multum vigilari velle; Martem nocturnas eruptiones et insidias multa re iuvare; Venerem vero et Liberum multo maxime pernoctantibus favere. Capit tum consilium Iuppiter Somni procreandi eumque in deum numerum adsciscit, nocti et otio praeficit eique claves oculorum tradit. Herbarum quoque sucos, quibus corda hominum Somnus sopiret, suis Iuppiter manibus temperat: securitatis et voluptatis herbae de caeli nemore advectae, de Acheruntis autem prateis leti herba petita. Eius leti guttam unam aspersisse minimam, quanta dissimulantis lacrima esse solet.

Hoc, inquit, suco soporem hominibus per oculorum repagula inriga: cuncti, quibus inrigaris, ilico post procumbent, proque mortuis immobiles iacebunt: tum tu ne timeto, nam vivent et paulo post, ubi evigilaverint, exsurgent.

Post id Iuppiter alas, non ut Mercurio talares, sed ut Amori umeris exaptas Somno adnexuit.

Non enim te solis, ait, et talari ornatu ad pupulas hominum et palpebras incurrere oportet curruli strepitu et cum fremitu equestri, sed placide et clementer pinnis

5. *insidias multa re iuvare*: ita conj. Schw.; *in. mutare iuvare*: cod.; *multas iuvare*: Ebertus; *mutas iuvare*: Mählius; *mature iurare*: Euss.; *omni ope iuvare*: Kluss.; *locare iuvare*: Brak.; Hauptius delet *mutare*.

17. *proque mortuis*: ita Kluss. ut jam conjecerat Hauptius; *proque demortuis*: Schw.; *artubus mortuis*: Brak.

21. *umeris exaptas*: ita em. Mählius pro cod. *umeros exaptos*.

22. *non enim te solis, ait, et talari ornatu*: ita em. Bährensius; *solis aut talari ornatu*: Nab.; *soleis*: conj. Mählius et Corn.; sed *solis = soliis*.

Then they say that Jupiter took counsel with the other gods and found that the practice of nightly vigils was somewhat in favour; that Juno gave birth to most of her children at night; that Minerva, mistress of arts and crafts, loved the midnight oil; that Mars often delighted in the darkness for his plots and sallies; and that Venus and Bacchus were specially gracious to those who roused by night. Then Jupiter determined to create Sleep, and added him to the number of the Gods, and set him in charge of the night and of rest, giving him the keys of human eyes. Also with his own hands Jupiter mixed the juices of herbs wherewith Sleep should soothe the hearts of men; herb of Safety and herb of Pleasure, gathered from a grove in Heaven; and from the meadows of Acheron he sought the herb of Death. Of this herb of Death he expressed but a tiny drop only, no bigger than a tear one might hide. "With this juice," he said, "shed slumber upon the eyelids of men. All upon whom you shed it will immediately after fall down and lie still, as if they were dead; then fear thou not, for they are alive, and in a while, when they have awakened, they will stand up again upon their feet."

After that Jupiter fastened wings upon Sleep, attached, not like Mercury's, to his heels, but like the wings of Love, to his shoulders. For he said, "it becomes thee not to approach men's eyes with sandals or with strapping upon thy heels, or to come upon their eyelids with the din of chariots and with the rushing of steeds, but quietly and

teneris in modum hirundinum advolare, non ut columbae alis plaudere.

Ad hoc, quo iucundior hominibus Somnus esset, donat ei multa somnia amoena, ut quo studio quisque devinctus esset, ut histrionem in somnis fautor spectaret, ut tibicinem audiret, ut aurigae agitanti <munus> monstraret, milites somnio vincerent, imperatores somnio triumpharent, peregrinantes somnio domum redirent. Ea somnia plerumque ad verum convertunt.

Igitur, Marce, si quo tibi somnio hinc opus est, censeo libens dormias tantisper dum quod cupis quodque exoptas, vigilanti tibi optingat.

1. *teneris*: Nab.; *exertis*: Corn.; *tentis*: Orellius.
3. *donat ei*: ita Haulerus cum cod.; cf. Brak. et Nov.; *donat et*: Nab.
4. *ut quo studio devinctus esset, ut histrionem* etc.: Nab.; *ut q. s. d. e. ⟨eo per quietem teneretur⟩ ut histrionem* etc. supp. Nov.
6. *ut aurigae agitanti ⟨munus⟩ monstraret*: sic supp. Brak.; *ut aurigae agitandi rationem demonstraret*: Nov. (cf. cod. *agitandi*): *ut aurigae agitanti monstraret palmam*: Ebertus.
9. *ad verum convertunt*: Nab.; *adversum*: cod.; *adversa*: Mütz.; *ad verbum*: Ehrent.

De Nepote amisso. II. Antonino Augusto Fronto.

Multis huiusce*modi* maeroribus fortuna me per omnem vitam meam exercuit. Nam ut alia mea acerba omittam, quinque amisi liberos miserrima quidem condicione temporum meorum: nam quinque omnes unumquemque semper unicum amisi, has orbitatis vices perpessus, ut numquam mihi nisi orbato filius nasceretur. Ita semper sine ullo solacio residuo liberos amisi, cum recenti luctu procreavi.

gently to fly, as upon the tender pinions of a swallow,—nay, with not so much as the flutter of a dove."

Furthermore, that Sleep might be more agreeable to men, he gave to him many pleasant dreams, according to every man's desire, that in his dreams one might watch his favourite actor, another listen to the flute, and another show his charioteer the prize in the race; that in his dream the soldier might be victorious; that in his dream the general might celebrate his triumph, and the wanderer in his dream return home. Yes—and sometimes those dreams come true.

So, Marcus, if you want any dream henceforth, I advise you to consent to sleep just a little while, till that which you desire and long for shall fall to you in your waking hours.

Fronto to Antoninus Augustus.

Through the whole of my life Fortune has visited me with many sorrows such as this. For (to pass over my other afflictions) I have lost five children under the most pitiful conditions possible; for I lost the five one by one, when each was my only child, and thus suffered these shocks of bereavement in such a manner that I never had a child except when I was already bereaved. In this way I always lost my children without solace, and got them amid fresh mourning.

Verum illos ego luctus toleravi fortius, quibus egomet ipse solus cruciabar. Namque meus animus meomet dolori obnixus oppositus quasi solitario certamine, unus uni, par pari resistebat. At nunc <nepote amisso meo> dolor dolore <mei generi> multiplicatur et cumulum luctuum meorum ferre nequeo; Victorini mei lacrimis tabesco, conliquesco. Saepe etiam expostulo cum dis immortalibus et fata iurgio compello.

Victorinum pietate, mansuetudine, veritate, innocentia maxima, omnium denique optimarum artium praecipuum virum acerbissima morte fili adflictum: hoccine ullo modo aequum aut iustum fuit? Si providentia res gubernantur, hoc idem recte provisum est? Si fato cuncta humana decernuntur, hoccine fato decerni *debuit*? Nullum ergo inter bonos ac malos fortunarum discrimen erit? Nulla deis, nulla fatis diiudicatio est, quali viro filius eripiatur? Facinorosus aliqui et scelestus mortalis, quem ipsum numquam nasci melius foret, incolumes liberos educit, in morte sua superstites relinquit: Victorinus, vir sanctus, cuius similes quam plurimos gigni optimum publicum fuerit, carissimo filio privatus est. Quae, malum! providentia tam inique prospicit? Fata a fando appellata aiunt: hoccine est recte fari? Poetae autem colus et fila fatis adsignant: nulla profecto tam sit inportuna et insciens lanifica, quae erili togae solidum *et* nodosum, servilei autem subtile et tenue suptemen neverit. Bonos viros luctu adfici, malos re familiari incolumi frui, neque mensum neque pensum fatorum lanificium duco.

4. *at nunc ⟨nepote amisso meo⟩ dolor dolore ⟨mei gene⟩ri multiplicatur*: ita supp. Schw.

5. *cumulum luctorum meorum ferre*: ita Nab.; supp. Brak. *diutius* post *meorum*.

28. *lanificium*: sic corr. Ehrent.; *lanificum*: cod.

But those sorrows I bore more bravely, since the pain of them was mine alone. For my spirit battled with my sorrow, facing it as though in single combat, and fought against it as foe with foe, like matched with like. But now (that I have lost my grandson) my sorrow is increased by the sorrow (of my son-in-law), and the burden of my grief is more than I can bear; at the tears of Victorinus I melt and dissolve into weeping. Aye, often do I quarrel with the immortal gods and upbraid the fates.

That Victorinus, affectionate, merciful, truthful, upright and excelling in all the fine arts, should be crushed by the bitter blow of his son's death—was this in any way just or fair? If providence governs the world, was this rightly "provided"? If all human affairs are decreed by fate, ought they to have been decreed by such a fate as this? Is there then to be no distinction between the fortunes of good and bad? Do not the gods or the fates discern the character of the man whose son is torn from his side? Some rascally scoundrel, who would have served the world better if he had never been born himself, brings up his children safe and sound and at his death leaves them to survive him; while Victorinus, a man of such stainless life that it were well for the state that many such be born, has lost his darling boy. What in the name of fortune is the providence whose provision is so unjust? They say that Fate is derived from *fari*, to speak; is this to speak correctly? Why, the poets assign to the fates distaffs and threads; surely no spinner would be so churlish and ignorant as to spin the threads of the master's robe coarse and knotted, but that of the slave's robe fine and delicate. That good men should be afflicted with sorrow and bad men enjoy their household safe and sound, seems to me neither the allotted work nor task for the spinning fates.

Nisi forte alius quidam nos error iactat et ignari rerum, quae mala sunt, quasi prospera concupiscimus; contra quae bona sunt, pro adversis aversamur et mors ipsa, quae omnibus luctuosa videtur, pausam laborum adfert et sollicitudinum et calamitatum, miserrimisque corporis vinculis liberatos ad tranquilla nos et amoena et omnibus bonis referta animarumque conciliabula travehit. Hoc ego ita esse facilius crediderim, quam cuncta humana aut nulla aut iniqua providentia regi.

Quodsi mors gratulanda potius est hominibus quam lamentanda, quanto quisque eam natu minor adeptus est, tanto beatior et deis acceptior existimandus est, ocius corporis malis exutus, ocius ad honores liberae animae usurpandos excitus. Quod tamen, verum sit licet, parvi nostra refert, qui desideramus amissos: nec quicquam nos animarum immortalitas consolatur, qui carissimis nostris dum vivimus caremus. Istum statum, vocem, formam, animam liberam quaerimus; faciem defunctorum miserandam maeremus, os obseratum, oculos eversos, colorem undique deletum. Si maxime esse animas immortalis constet, erit hoc philosophis disserendi argumentum, non parentibus desiderandi remedium.

Sed utcumque sunt ista divinitus ordinata, mihi quidem neutiquam diutinam adferent sollicitudinem, cui tam propinqua mors....Meus etiam iam hinc me dulcissimus nepos, quem ipse sinu meo educo, hic est profecto,

1. *alius...error*: ita cod.; *altus*: Fröhn.; *avius*: Ehrent.; cf. Sen. *Troad.* 572; conj. etiam *antiquus*, *avitus*, *avios quidem* (=γε).

3. *mors ipsa*: sic conj. Alanus; cf. Schw. et Euss. Videt Brak. in cod. *morsip*....

14. *quod tamen, verum sit licet*: ita interpunxit Kluss.

18. *faciem*: Maius; *aciem*: cod.; *maciem*: Alanus.

Unless, perhaps, it is really another misconception which is tossing us hither and thither in error, and in our ignorance we are desiring things which are evil as though they were good, and on the other hand shrinking from things that are good as if they were hurtful; it may be that death itself, which seems grievous to all, brings rest from toil and anxiety and trouble, and bears us, set free from the wretched fetters of the body, to regions calm and pleasant and filled with all things good, and to the meeting places of souls. I could more easily believe that this is so than that all human affairs are controlled by no providence at all, or by a providence which is unjust.

But if death is a cause for rejoicing rather than for grief to men, then the younger one dies the happier and the more beloved by the gods ought he to be esteemed, seeing that he has laid aside the sooner the ills of the body and has been called forth the sooner to enjoy the functions of a free soul. Yet, though this be true, it makes little difference to us who yearn for our dead; nor does the immortality of the soul afford any comfort to us, who all the days of our life miss our dear ones. The familiar pose, the voice, the figure, the free spirit,—it is these we seek; over the face of the dead, so pitiful, we grieve,—the lips tight shut, the eyes upturned, the hue of life everywhere fled. However surely it be established that the soul is immortal, this will be but the subject of a philosopher's discussion; it will never heal a parent's grief. But, however those things may be ordered by Heaven, I, to whom death is so near, shall in no wise be troubled by them long....

Henceforth it is my sweetest grandson, whom I am

qui me magis magisque lacerat prorsus et excruciat. Namque in huius facie illum amissum contemplor, exemplum oris imaginor, sonum vocis eundem animo fingo. Hanc sibi dolor meus picturam commentatur. Verum defuncti voltum ignorans, dum verisimilem coniecto, maceror.

Sapiet mea filia: viro suo omnium quantum est hominum optimo adquiescet: is eam consolabitur pariter lacrimando, pariter suspirando, loquendo pariter conticiscendo. Senex ego parens indigne consolabor; dignius enim foret ipsum me ante obisse. Neque ulla poetarum carmina aut sapientium praecepta tantum promoverint ad luctum filiae meae sedandum et dolorem leniendum, quantum mariti vox e carissimo pectore et iunctissimo profecta.

Me autem consolatur aetas mea prope iam edita et morti proxima. Quae cum aderit, si noctis, si lucis id tempus erit, caelum quidem consalutabo discedens et quae mihi conscius sum protestabor: nihil in longo vitae meae spatio a me admissum, quod dedecori aut probro aut flagitio foret: nullum in aetate agunda avarum, nullum perfidum facinus meum extitisse; contraque multa liberaliter, multa amice, multa fideliter, multa constanter, saepe etiam cum periculo capitis consulta. Cum fratre optimo concordissime vixi, quem patris vestri bonitate summos honores adeptum gaudeo, vestra vero amicitia satis quietum et multum securum video. Honores, quos ipse adeptus sum, numquam inprobis rationibus concupivi. Animo potius quam corpori curando operam dedi. Studia doctrinae rei familiari meae praetuli. Pauperem me quam

18. *protestabor: nihil* etc.: ita interpunxit Kluss.

bringing up myself in my own care—it is actually he who increases my anguish, aye, my torture; for in his features I look again upon my lost darling, I seem to see the image of his face, I imagine that I hear the very sound of his voice. This is the picture upon which my grief dwells. But it is torture not to know the dead child's face, while I picture what it was like.

My daughter will be wise; she will lean upon her husband, the best man in the world. He will comfort her by sharing her tears and sighs, her speech and silence. It will not be decent that I, her old father, should comfort her—I, who ought in decency to have died first. No poet's verse, no philosopher's precepts, would so avail to soothe my daughter's pain and assuage her grief as her husband's words, springing from his dear heart, so closely knit to her own.

But I find my comfort in the tale of my years that is now all but told; for death is close at hand, and when death comes, be it by day or night, as I depart I shall greet the Heavens and testify as my conscience bids me:

"In the long years of my life I have done nothing which would bring dishonour, shame or disgrace; no deed of avarice or treachery have I done in all my life; nay rather, much generosity and friendliness, much loyalty and faithfulness have I shown, even at the risk of my life. I have lived most amicably with my excellent brother, and I rejoice that he attained to high office by your father's grace; and I see that since he enjoys your friendship he is at peace in perfect security. The offices which I held myself I never sought by underhand means. I have cultivated my mind rather than my body. I have preferred the pursuit of learning to wealth. I have

ope cuiusquam adiutum, postremo egere quam poscere malui. Sumptu numquam prodigo fui, quaestu interdum necessario. Verum dixi sedulo, verum audivi libenter. Potius duxi neglegi quam blandiri, tacere quam fingere, infrequens amicus esse quam frequens adsentator. Pauca petii, non pauca merui. Quod cuique potui, pro copia commodavi. Merentibus promtius, immerentibus audacius opem tuli. Neque me parum gratus quispiam repertus segniorem effecit ad beneficia quaecumque possem prompte inpertienda. Neque ego unquam ingratis offensior fui.... Multum et graviter male valui, mi Marce carissime; dein casibus miserrimis adflictus, tum uxorem amisi, nepotem in Germania amisi: miserum me! Decimanum nostrum amisi. Ferreus si essem, plura scribere non possem isto in tempore. Librum misi tibi quem pro omnibus haberes.

5. *pauca petii, non pauca merui*: ita cod.; *p. p. n. p. renui*: conj. Corn.

11. *multum et graviter male valui, mi Marce carissime; dein casibus miserrimis adflictus, tum uxorem amisi, nepotem in Germania amisi*: ita interpunxit Brak.; cf. Kluss.; *multum et graviter valui, m. M. C. Dein casibus m. adflictus sum: uxorem* etc.: Nab.

preferred to be poor rather than to be indebted to another's help, and, in the last extremity, to want rather than to beg. I was never extravagant with my money. I have earned it sometimes from necessity. I have done my best to speak the truth and have never shirked hearing it. I preferred to be slighted rather than to fawn, I preferred silence to hypocrisy and to be the friend of few rather than the flatterer of many. I have sought little and deserved much. I have assisted everyone according to my means, as far as I could. I have given help readily to the deserving, recklessly to the undeserving. No one by turning out ungrateful has made me more slow in bestowing readily all the benefits I could give, nor have I ever been harsh to the ungrateful.

. . . . . .

I have suffered from long and serious illnesses, my dearest Marcus; then I was visited by pitiful calamities; I lost my wife and I lost my grandson in Germany. Woe is me! I have lost my Decimanus. If I were made of iron I could write no more just now. I have sent you a book to take the place of all.

NOTES

Ep. ad M. Caes. II. 3, pp. 28, 29.

This letter is a reply to the *Laudatio* pronounced by Fronto in the Senate upon Antoninus Pius, on Aug. 13, 143 A.D.

Cf. *ad M. Caes.* II. 1, p. 25.

Ep. ad M. Caes. III. 2, pp. 40, 41.

The date of the quarrel between Fronto and the Greek rhetorician, Herodes Atticus, is a disputed point. In 125 A.D. Hadrian made Herodes Atticus administrator of the free cities of Asia, but about 140 he was summoned to Rome to become tutor to the young princes. (*Vid.* H. Kämmel, *Jahrbuch*, 1870, pt 2, vol. 102, p. 13.) A year or two later serious charges were brought against him by an Athenian deputation, headed by the orators Theodotus and Demostratus. Fronto appeared for the prosecution, but in spite of this Marcus Aurelius effected a reconciliation between his two tutors, who became fast friends. Cf. p. 60 and p. 111, "Herodes nunc summus meus"; and cf. *Ep. ad M. Caes.* III. 3, 4, 5 and 6. The *consolatio* to Herodes Atticus upon the death of his son (*Ep. Graeca* 3, pp. 243, 244) was written when Fronto was consul-elect, i.e., in 143 A.D.; for cf. *Ep. ad M. Caes.* I. 6, p. 17: "Herodi filius, natus hodie, mortuus est. Id Herodes non aeque fert animo" (cf. Ed. Hauler, *Wien. Stud.* 1907, p. 328). *Ep. ad M. Caes.* I. 7, in which Fronto refers to his consulship and to the joy which Marcus' congratulations had given him, is an answer to *Ep. ad M. Caes.* I. 6, which can therefore be assigned to the same year.

The reconciliation must have been an accomplished fact by 143 A.D., and Mommsen was therefore mistaken in assigning the

series of letters *Ep. ad M. Caes.* II. 2—6, to 143—145 A.D. Naber gives 139 as the probable date, but this appears to be too early to agree with the date of Herodes' appointment as tutor. The letters may therefore be assigned to 141 or 142 A.D., when Marcus was 20 or 21 years of age.

Ep. ad M. Caes. IV. 13, pp. 75, 76.

This C. Aufidius is C. Aufidius Victorinus, who became Fronto's son-in-law; cf. *Ep. ad Amic.* II. 10, p. 200, "Aufidium Victorinum... filiam meam despondi ei, nec melius aut mihi in posteritatem, aut meae filiae in omnem vitam consulere potui, quam cum talem mihi generum cum illis moribus tantaque eloquentia elegi"; cf. pp. 96, 179, 232, 181, 182, etc. He was one of the ablest men of the period, was "praefectus urbi" and twice consul. He committed suicide in 186 A.D. Cf. Dio Cass. LXXII. 11: "*καίπερ καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Μάρκου ἐν τοῖς πάνυ τιμηθεὶς καὶ τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρετῇ καὶ τῇ τῶν λόγων παρασκευῇ οὐδενὸς τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν δεύτερος γενόμενος.*"

This is one of the few letters in the Correspondence which we can date with certainty. Marcus Aurelius was born in April 121 A.D., and as he refers to himself in this letter as being twenty-five years of age ("viginti quinque natus annos") the letter must have been written in 146 A.D., or the first three months of 147. It is the last letter in which Marcus sends his mother's greetings. After this there is a gap of fifteen years in the Correspondence, and in *Ep. ad M. Ant. Imp.* II. 2 there is no mention of her.

Ep. ad M. Ant. Imp. I. 2 (pt), pp. 95, 96.

This letter is an answer to the preceding, in which reference is made to the little Antoninus, twin-brother of Commodus (cf. p. 101), and to Faustina, Marcus Aurelius' wife, who is picking up her strength again ("nostra Faustina reficit sanitatem"). The twins were born on Aug. 31, 161 A.D. No reference is made in these two letters to the departure of Verus for Syria, and Brakman therefore assigns them to the early part of 162 A.D.

Ad Ant. Imp. I. 3 (p. 101).

This letter is answered by the following, in which reference is made to the absence of Verus from Rome. Consequently Brakman assigns it to 163 A.D., the year of the departure of Verus for Syria. Mommsen had suggested 162 as the probable date. The children referred to are the twins, Antoninus and Commodus, and the letter disposes once for all of the suggestion that Commodus was not Marcus Aurelius' son. The little Antoninus died in 165.

Ad Ver. Imp. I. 1 (pt), pp. 113, 114.

The date of this letter is uncertain. It must, however, have been written after Verus became joint-Emperor. The letter opens with a very corrupt passage in which Fronto maintains the absurdity of expecting the various sculptors and artists to produce work which is not in their own special line. This passage has been tackled by O. Jahn (*Philol.* 28), Professor Robinson Ellis, Brakman and others, and finally an admirable reconstruction of it has been given by Dr Hauler in *Archiv* 15. 1908, pp. 106—112 (cf. also *Mitteil. des kais. deut. arch. Instituts Rom*, Abteilung 19, 1904). The letter contains Fronto's defence against the neo-Ciceronian school. For his criticism of poets, historians and orators see Professor Minton Warren's article in *Transactions and Proceedings of the American philological association*, 1894.

Ad Ver. Imp. II. 1 (pt), pp. 119, 120; pp. 122—124.

Mommsen assigns this letter to 164 A.D., since there is no mention in it of the capture of Ctesiphon in 165. The Parthian expedition falls into two parts:

(i) the Armenian, ending with the capture of Artaxata by Statius Priscus in 163;

(ii) the Parthian proper, ending with the capture of Ctesiphon by Avidius Cassius and Martius Crispus in 165.

This letter is written after the arrival of despatches about (i), i.e., about 164. We have coins of that year on which Verus has the title *Armeniacus*.

Ad Ver. Imp. II. 3, pp. 131, 132.

The date of this letter is probably 165 A.D., since the Parthian campaign is apparently just over.

De Orationibus (pt), pp. 155—158.

The date is again the subject of dispute. Mommsen maintains that it was written after 175 A.D., on the evidence of the reference on p. 162 to coins bearing the name of Commodus. No coins were struck with the name of Marcus Aurelius' son and successor till 175, but Commodus was also one of the names of Lucius Verus, and the reference here may be to him.

Brakman and Naber assign the letter to 162 A.D., and the former believes it to be earlier than the *de Eloquentia* on the ground that it is less bitter in tone. For *catachanna* cf. p. 35, and Plin. *N. H.* XVII. 15; for *Sergius* vid. Quint. VIII. 3. 33.

Ad Ant. Pium 2 (pt), p. 164.

Brakman assigns this to 143, on the supposition that it is an answer to the *laudatio* of the 13th of August of that year (cf. p. 25, etc.). But the reference to Faustina seems naturally to refer to the elder Faustina, Antoninus Pius' wife, who died, according to Capitolinus (*Vit. M. Ant. Phil.* 6), in 140 or 141. Consequently I should prefer to assign the letter to some date before 140; for the *Laudatio* of 143 was not the only panegyric which Fronto delivered upon Antoninus Pius, and this letter may well refer to an earlier speech. The only other alternative (supposing Capitolinus' date to be accurate) is to refer *Faustinae meae* to Antoninus Pius' daughter, the wife of Marcus Aurelius.

Gyara was a small island in the Aegean, used by the Romans under the Empire as a place of exile for criminals; cf. Juv. X. 170, Tac. *Ann.* IV. 30, etc.

Ad Ant. Pium 8, p. 169.

This letter has been assigned by Mommsen to 149 A.D. (cf. *Hermes*, VIII. p. 212). The province of Africa fell to Fronto's colleague, and that of Asia to himself; cf. sup. p. 158.

De Fer. Als. 3 (pt), pp. 227—230.

The date is probably about 161 A.D.

For the panegyrics upon Smoke and Dust *vid.* pp. 211 ff.; cf. sup. pp. 120, 121. I am greatly indebted in my translation to the exquisite rendering of this Fable of Sleep by Walter Pater in *Marius the Epicurean.*

De Nep. Am. 2, pp. 232—236.

In *ad Ver. Imp.* II. 9, p. 137. 13, Fronto refers to the loss of his wife and his little three-year old grandson; "in paucissimis mensibus et uxorem carissimam et nepotem trimulum amisi." In the same letter he refers to the *Commentarium* which Verus had promised to send to assist him in the production of the *Principia Historiae*. This letter was therefore probably written in 165 A.D. and to that year we may assign also the two letters *de nepote amisso*. This date accords with Fronto's references to himself in *de Nep. Am.* 2, as an old man who has not long to live. This letter is agreed by many critics to be the worthiest production of Fronto's pen:—"Bowed down by a real grief, all his wonted affectation vanished and nature reasserted her sway." (Hastings Crossley.) "Fronto's reply (i.e., to *de Nep. Am.* 1, a brief letter of condolence from Marcus Aurelius) is full of pathos, though rather self-conscious....His affectations fall away from him, as the cry of pain is forced from his heart." (W. H. D. Rouse, to whose translation I am indebted.) "Ein schöner und lesenswerther Aufsatz." (Bähr.)

The *dulcissimus Nepos* to whom Fronto refers in the letter was perhaps, as Mai thought, the M. Aufidius Fronto who was consul in 199, and who erected to his son, M. Aufidius Fronto, the tomb at Pisaurum bearing the inscription (Orelli, 1176) in which Fronto the rhetorician is mentioned:

"M. Aufidio Frontoni pronepoti M. Corneli Frontonis oratoris consulis magistri imperatorum Luci et Antonini nepoti Aufidi Victorini praefecti urbi bis consulis Fronto consul filio dulcissimo."

But cf. Niebuhr, p. 145, Note (i). It is not clear whether Decimanus is the name of the grandson or not The text of the conclusion of the letter is very corrupt.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

EDITIONS

Mai, Angelo. (The Ambrosian portion of the codex only.) Milan, 1815. 4to.

Niebuhr, B. G., with Buttmann, Ph. and Heindorf, L. F. (Ambrosian portion only.) Berlin, 1816. 8vo.

Mai, A. (Ambrosian and Vatican portions.) Rome, 1823. 8vo.

Cabban, Armand. *Lettres inédites de Marc-Aurèle et de Fronton.* Paris, 1830. 8vo.

Mai, A. (Vatican portion only.) Zell, 1832. 8vo.

Naber, S. A. (Complete text.) Leipzig, 1867. 8vo.

Cod. Vat. 5750 rescriptus (facsimile edition). Milan, 1906. 46 × 38 cm.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Archiv = Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie (Wölfflin). Leipzig, 1884–

Class. Rev. = Classical Review, 1887–

Herm. = Hermes. Berlin, 1866–

Jahrbuch. = Jahrbücher (Neue) f. class. Philologie und Pädagogik (Fleckeisen). Continued as N. J. f. d. klass. Alterthum. Leipzig, 1831–

Jahresbericht = Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der class. Alterthumswissenschaft. (Bursian-Müller.) Berlin, 1873–

J. d. Sav. = Journal des Savants. Paris, 1816–

J. of Phil. = Journal of Philology. 1868–

Mnem. = Mnemosyne. Leyden, 1852–

Musee Belge. Louvain, 1897–
Philol. = Philologus. Göttingen, 1846. Leipzig, 1897–
Rev. Archéol. = Revue archéologique. Paris, 1844–
Rev. d. d. Mondes = Revue des deux Mondes. Paris, 1829–
Rev. de Phil. = Revue de philologie. Paris, 1877–
Rhein. Mus. = Rheinisches Museum f. Philologie. Frankfurt a. M. 1827–
Riv. di fil. = Rivista di filologia. Turin, 1873–
Sitzungsb. d. k. b. Akad. d. Wiss. = Sitzungsberichte d. könig. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München, 1860–
Verhand. d. Vers. d. d. Philol. u. Schülm. = Verhandlungen der Versammlung d. deutschen Philologen und Schulmänner. Leipzig, 1838–
Wien. Stud. = Wiener Studien. Zeitschrift f. klass. Philologie. Vienna, 1879–
Wochenschrift = Wochenschrift f. klass. Philologie. Berlin, 1874–
Zeitschrift f. d. Gym. = Zeitschrift f. d. Gymnasialwesen. Berlin, 1847–
Zeitschrift f. d. öst. Gym. = Zeitschrift f. d. österreich. Gymnasien. Vienna, 1850–
Zeitschrift f. rom. Phil. = Zeitschrift f. romanische Philologie. Halle, 1877–

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON AFRICAN LATIN

Aubé, B. in Rev. archéol. 41. 1881, p. 250.
Bayard, L. Le Latin de St Cyprien. Paris, 1902.
Becker, H. Studia Apuleiana. Berlin, 1879.
Benson, E. W. (Abp). Cyprian. His life, his times, his work. London, 1897.
Boissier, G. Commodien; in Mélanges Renier, pp. 37 ff. (Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études, Vol. 73.) Paris, 1887.
—— Review of "Les Africains" (Monceaux), in J. d. Sav. 1895. pp. 35 ff.
—— Review of "Musées et Collections archéologiques de l'Algérie et de la Tunisie" (R. Cagnat et P. Gauckler, Paris, 1895); in J. d. Sav. 1896, pp. 501 ff.

Bonnet, M. Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours. Paris, 1890.

Burkitt, F. C. The old Latin and the Itala. Cambridge, 1896.

Cagnat, R. L'armée romaine d'Afrique. Paris, 1892.

Cagnat, R. and Gauckler, P. Les monuments historiques de la Tunisie, Pt i. Paris, 1898.

Carnoy, A. Le Latin d'Espagne d'après les inscriptions. Brussels, 1906. (2nd ed.)

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, Vol. viii. Inscriptiones Africae Latinae, Pts 1 and 2. Gustavus Willmanns. Berlin, 1881. Supplement, Pts 1, 2 and 3. R. Cagnat, Ioh. Schmidt, and H. Dessau. Berlin, 1891—1904.

Dalmassi, L. L' arcaismo nell' Octavius di Minucio Felice ; in Riv. di fil. 37. 1909. pp. 7—37.

Dubois, A. La Latinité d'Ennodius. Paris, 1903.

Édon, G. Écriture et prononciation du latin savant et du latin populaire. Paris, 1882.

Ephemeris Epigraphica. Corporis inscriptionum latinarum supplementum, Vol. v. Additamenta ad Corporis Vol. viii., pp. 265—568, and pp. 649—651. Ioh. Schmidt. Rome and Berlin, 1884.

Ferrère, F. Langue et style de Victor de Vita ; in Rev. de phil. 25 pp. 110 ff. and pp. 320 ff. 1901.

Gölzer, H. La Latinité de St Jérôme. Paris, 1884.

Grandgent, C. H. An Introduction to Vulgar Latin. Boston, 1907.

Heraeus, W. Die Sprache des Petronius und die Glossen. Leipzig, 1899.

Hoffmann, Max. Index grammaticus ad Africae provinciarum, Tripolitanae, Byzacenae, Proconsularis titulos latinos. Strasburg, 1879.

Hoppe, H. Syntax und Stil des Tertullians. Leipzig, 1903.

Kaulen, F. Handbuch zur Vulgata. Mainz, 1870.

Koffmane, G. Geschichte des Kirchenlateins. Breslau, 1879.

Koziol, H. Der Stil des Apuleius. Vienna, 1872.

Kretschmann, H. De latinitate L. Apulei Madaurensis. Königsberg, 1865.

Kroll, W. Das afrikanische Latein ; in Rhein. Mus. 52. 1897. pp. 569 ff.

Kuebler, B. Die lateinische Sprache auf afrikanischen Inschriften; in Archiv 8. 1893. pp. 161 ff.

Lattes, E. Etruskische Analogieen zu lateinischen Africismen; in Archiv 8. 1893. pp. 495 ff.

Ludwig, E. De Petronii sermone plebeio. Marburg, 1869.

Möller, C. W. G. Titulorum Africanorum orthographia. Greifswald, 1875.

Mohl, F. G. Introduction à la Chronologie du latin vulgaire. Paris, 1899.

Monceaux, P. Les Africains. Vol. I., ch. 4 ("Le Latin d'Afrique"). Paris, 1894.

—— Le Latin Vulgaire; in Rev. d. d. Mondes, 106. 1891. pp. 429 ff.

Olcott, G. N. Studies in the word-formation of Latin inscriptions. Rome, 1898.

Orelli, Ioh. Casp. Inscriptionum latinarum selectarum amplissima collectio. 3 vols. Zürich, 1828–56.

Pirson, J. La Langue des inscriptions latines de la Gaule. Brussels. 1901.

—— Style des inscriptions latines de la Gaule; in Musée Belge, Vol. II. 1898. pp. 97—125.

Praun, J. Bemerkungen zur Syntax des Vitruvs. Bamberg, 1885.

Regnier, Ad. De la latinité des sermons de Saint Augustin. Paris, 1886.

Renier, L. Inscriptions romaines de l'Algérie. Paris, 1858.

Ritter, Fr. Die Darstellung der ersten Christlichen Schriftsteller Africa's; in Zeitschrift f. philos. u. kath. Theol. Vol. VIII. 1833. pp. 32 ff.

Rönsch, H. Itala und Vulgata. Marburg and Leipzig, 1869.

Schuchardt, H. Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins. Leipzig, 1866.

Sittl, K. Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des afrikanischen Lateins. Erlangen, 1882.

—— In Jahresbericht, 68. 1891. pp. 226 ff. Berlin, 1892.

—— Was ist Vulgär-latein? in Verhand. d. 40. Vers. deutsch. Phil. u. Schülm. Leipzig, 1890. pp. 385 ff.

Vogel, Th. Afrikanisches Latein (review of Sittl's Lok. Versch.); in Jahrbuch 27. 1883. pp. 177 ff.

Watson, E. W. The style and language of St Cyprian; in Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica. Vol. IV. Essay 5. Oxford, 1896.
Weise, O. Language and character of the Roman people. Translated by H. A. Strong and A. J. Campbell. London, 1909.
Weyman, Carl. Studien zu Apuleius und seinen Nachahmern; in Sitzungsb. d. Akad. d. Wiss. zu München. 1893. Vol. II. pp. 321 ff.
Wölfflin, Ed. Über die Latinität des Cassius Felix; in Sitzungsb. d. phil. u. hist. Classe zu München, 1880. pp. 381 ff.
—— Vulgär-latein; in Philol. 34. 1876. pp. 148 ff.
—— Der Reim im Lateinischen; in Archiv 1. 1884. pp. 350 ff.
—— Die ersten Spuren des afrikanischen Lateins; in Archiv 6. 1894. pp. 1 ff.
—— Zur Alliteration; in Archiv 9. 1897. pp. 567 ff.
—— Die Entwicklung des Infinitivus historicus; in Archiv 10. 1898. pp. 177 ff.
—— Miscellen; ib. pp. 534 ff.
Zink, M. Der Mythologe Fulgentius. Würzburg, 1867.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE TEXT

Alan, H. Observationes in Frontonem. Dublin, 1841, 1863 and 1867.
Bährens, E. In Jahrbuch 105. 1872. pp. 632—634.
Blase, H. In Archiv 9. 1896. p. 491.
Braakman, C. Frontoniana (2 vols.). Utrecht, 1902.
Böcheler, F. In Jahrbuch 105. 1872. p. 565.
Cobet, C. G. In Mnem. 3. 1875. p. 305.
Cornelissen, J. J. In Mnem. 13. 1885. pp. 115 ff.
Desbouserraux, A. M. In Rev. de Phil. 10. 1886. pp. 149 ff.
Ebert, Ad. Op. inf. cit. pp. 47—49.
Ehrenthal, L. Quaestiones Frontonianae. Königsberg, 1881.
Ellis, Robinson. In J. of Phil. 1. 1868. pp. 15 ff.
—— In The Correspondence of Fronto and Marcus Aurelius (vid. inf.). London, 1904. pp. 24 ff.
Eussner, Ad. In Jahrbuch 107. 1873. pp. 522, 523.
—— In Rhein. Mus. 25. 1870. pp. 541 ff.

Fröhner, W. In Philologus Suppl. 5. 1889. pp. 49 ff.
Hauler, Ed. Vortrag über das Ergebnis der neuen Untersuchung der Mailänder Frontoreste; in d. Verh. d. 41. Vers. d. Phil. u. Schülm. in Köln. 1895. pp. 78 ff. Leipzig, 1896.
—— Sallustcitate bei Fronto; in Rhein. Mus. 54. Pt 2, pp. 161 ff. 1899.
—— Frontonianum; in Serta Harteliana. pp. 263 ff. Vienna, 1896.
—— In Zeitschrift Theodor Gomperz, p. 392. Vienna, 1902.
—— Review of Brakman's Frontoniana; in Zeitschrift f. d. öst. Gymn. Vienna, 1903. pp. 32 ff.
—— In Mitteilungen des deutschen archeologischen Instituts; Röm. Abteilung 19. Rome, 1904. pp. 317 ff.
—— In Mélanges Boissier. Paris, 1903. pp. 245 ff.
—— Bericht über den Stand der Fronto-Ausgabe; in d. Verh. d. 48. Vers. d. Phil. u. Schülm. in Hamburg 1905. pp. 51 ff. Leipzig, 1906.
—— In Archiv 10. 1868. p. 145.
—— In Archiv 15. 1908. pp. 106 ff.
—— Wien. Stud. 22. 1900. p. 138 and p. 140.
—— „ „ 23. 1901. p. 338.
—— „ „ 24. Pt 1. 1902. p. 232 and pp. 519 ff.
—— „ „ 25. Pt 1. 1903. pp. 162 ff.
—— „ „ 26. 1904. p. 344.
—— „ „ 27. Pt. 1. 1905. p. 146.
—— „ „ ib. Pt 2. 1905. p. 304.
—— „ „ 28. Pt 1. 1906. p. 169.
—— „ „ 29. Pt 1. 1907. p. 172.
—— „ „ ib. Pt 2. 1907. p. 238.
—— „ „ 31. Pt 1. 1909. pp. 179, 180.
—— In Wiener Eranos (z. 50. Vers. d. Phil. u. Schülm.). Vienna, 1909. pp. 213 ff.
Haupt, M. In Index lectionum Berolinensium. Berlin, 1867. pp. 3 ff.
—— In Herm. 5. 1871. pp. 190, 191.
—— In Herm. 8. 1874. p. 178.
Havet, L. Le reviseur du MS. de Fronton; in Rev. de Phil. 10. 1886. p. 189.
Hertz, M. In Jahrbuch 93. 1866. pp. 579, 580.
—— In Rhein. Mus. 1874. p. 29 and p. 367.

HERTZ, M. In Philol. 1876. p. 757.
HERWERDEN, N. VAN. In Mnem. 1. 1873. pp. 293, 294.
JACOBS, FR. Notae criticae ; in Wolf's Analecten, i. pp. 108 ff. and ii. pp. 246 ff. Berlin, 1817–18.
JORDAN, H. In Herm. 6. 1872. p. 80.
KESSLER, K. C. G. De locis qui in M. Frontonis epistulis...ab A. Maio inscriptis litura corrupti deprehenduntur, etc. Leipzig, 1829.
KIEHL, E. J. and NABER, S. A. In Mnem. 2. 1874. pp. 225 ff.
KLUSSMANN, R. Emendationum Frontonianarum particula. Göttingen, 1871.
—— Emendationes Frontonianae. Berlin, 1874.
—— In Jahrbuch 109. 1874. pp. 636 ff.
—— In Curae Africanae. Gera. 1883.
—— In Archiv 8. 1893. pp. 134, 135.
MADVIG, IOH. N. Adversaria Critica. ii. pp. 613 ff. Copenhagen, 1873.
MÄHLY, J. In Philol. 17. 1861. pp. 176 ff.
—— In Philol. 19. 1863. pp. 159 ff.
MÜLLER, C. W. F. In Jahrbuch 93. 1866. pp. 487 ff.
MÜTZELL, J. In Zeitschrift f. d. Gymn. 13. 1859. p. 640.
NABER, S. A. In Mnem. 24. 1896. p. 396.
NOVÁK, R. In Wien. Stud. 19. 1897. pp. 242 ff.
ORELLI, IOH. C. Crestomathia Frontoniana ; Appendix to Tacitus' 'Dialogus.' Zürich, 1830. pp. 115 ff.
PHILIBERT-SOUPÉ, A. De Frontonis reliquiis. Amiens, 1853.
RIESE, A. In Jahrbuch 91. 1865. p. 146.
SCHÄFER, ARN. In Philol. 26. 1867. pp. 574 f.
SCHENKL, K. In Zeitschrift f. d. öst. Gymn. 26. 1875. pp. 30 ff.
SCHNEIDEWIN, F. W. In Philol. 10. 1855. p. 321.
SCHOPEN, L. Emendationes Frontonianae (Pts 1 and 2). Bonn. 1830 and 1841.
STUDEMUND, W. App. to Klussmann's Emendationes Frontonianae. Berlin, 1874.
USENER, H. In Jahrbuch 91. 1865. pp. 267, 268.
VAHLEN, J. In Zeitschrift f. d. öst. Gymn. 19. 1868. p. 10.
VALMAGGI, L. Quaestiones Frontonianae. Iporegia, 1889.
WORDSWORTH, C. In J. of Phil. i. 1868. p. 160.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adlington, W. The Golden Ass of Apuleius. Translated by W. A. (1566), with introduction by Chas. Whibley. London, 1893.

Aubé, Barthélemy. Histoire des persécutions de l'Église. Vol. I. La polémique païenne à la fin du IIe siècle. Paris, 1875.

Beltrami, Achille. Le tendenze letterarie negli scritti del Frontone. Milan, 1907.

—— Il "numerus" e Frontone; in Riv. di fil. 36. 1908 (Oct.). pp. 545 ff.

Bernhardy, G. Grundriss der römischen Litteratur. Brunswick, 1865.

Boissier, Gaston. L'Afrique romaine. Promenades archéologiques en Algérie et en Tunisie. Paris, 1895.

Authorised Translation by A. Ward. New York, 1899.

—— La Jeunesse de Marc-Aurèle; in Rev. d. d. Mondes, 74. pp. 670 ff. London, 1868.

—— La religion romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins. 2 vols. Paris, 1874.

—— La fin du paganisme. 2 vols. Paris, 1898.

Boissière, G. Esquisse d'une Histoire de la conquête et de l'administration romaines dans le nord d'Afrique. Paris, 1878.

Byrne, F. D. Translation of the Golden Ass of Apuleius, with introduction and notes. London, 1905.

Capes, W. W. The Age of the Antonines; in Epochs of Ancient History. London, 1876.

Charpentier, J. P. Les écrivains latins de l'Empire. Ch. XIX. pp. 387 ff. (on Apuleius). Paris, 1859.

Comparetti, Dom. Vergil in the Middle Ages. Translated by E. F. M. Benecke. London, 1908.

Crossley, Hastings. The Correspondence of Fronto and Marcus Aurelius; appendix to his edition and translation of Meditations, Book IV. London, 1882.

Cruttwell, C. T. History of Roman Literature. London, 1878.

Cucheval, V. Histoire de l'éloquence romaine depuis la mort de Cicéron jusqu'à l'avènement de l'Empereur Hadrien. Paris, 1893.

d'Artigne-Peyrou, J. Marc-Aurèle dans ses rapports avec le Christianisme. Paris, 1897.

Daunou. Review of Mai's 1815 edition; in Journ. d. Sav. Sept. 1816. pp. 27 ff.

de Champagny, Nompère. Les Antonins. Paris, 1863.

—— La religion romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins. (Review of Boissier, vid. sup.) Paris, 1874.

de Suckau, E. Étude sur Marc-Aurèle. Paris, 1857.

des Vergers, Noël. Essai sur Marc-Aurèle. Paris, 1860.

Dill, S. Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius. London, 1904.

Dräger, A. Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache. Leipzig, 1878.

Droz, E. De M. Cornelii Frontonis institutione oratoria. Besançon, 1885.

Ebert, Ad. De Frontonis Syntaxi; in Acta Semin. phil. Erlangensis. Vol. II. pp. 231 ff. Erlangen, 1881.

Eckstein. In Ersch (J. S.) and Grüber (J. G.)'s Allgemeine Encyclopädie. Section I. Pt 51. pp. 442 ff.

Ellis, Robinson. The Correspondence of Fronto and Marcus Aurelius. London, 1904.

Förster, E. Marci Aurelii Antonini vita et philosophia. Rastede, 1869.

Freytag, F. G. Ex antiqua historia litteraria de M. Corn. Frontone et Frontoniarum secta rhetorica. Nuremberg, 1732.

Friedländer, L. Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit von August bis zum Ausgang der Antonine (7th ed.). 2 vols. Leipzig, 1901.

Gibbon, Ed. The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Vol. I. London, 1903. (In the "World's Classics" series.)

Glover, T. R. The Conflict of religions in the Early Roman Empire. London, 1902.

Graham, Alex. Roman Africa. London, 1902.

Hertz, M. Renaissance und Rococo in der römischen Litteratur. Berlin, 1865.

Hildebrand, G. F. Apuleius, Opera omnia. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1842.

Holme, L. R. The Christian Church in N. Africa. Hulsean Essay, 1895. London, 1898.

Jackson, J. Translation of the Meditations; with introduction by C. Bigg. London, 1906.

Jahresbericht (Bursian-Müller), Vols. vi. vii. xviii. xxvii. xxviii. xl. xlviii. lv. lxviii. lxxxiv.; for references see *General-Register* to Vols. i.–lxxxvii., published by Bloch and Todtmann. Leipzig, 1898.

Jordan, H. Rhythmische Prosa in der alt-christlichen lateinischen Litteratur. Leipzig, 1905.

Knapp, Ch. Archaism in Aulus Gellius; in Studies in honour of Henry Drisler. pp. 126 ff. New York, 1894.

Lacour-Gayet, G. Antonin-le-pieux. Châtillon-sur-Seine. 1888.

Leclercq, H. L'Afrique Chrétienne. Paris, 1904.

Long, George. The Thoughts of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, with a life of the Emperor, and an Essay on his philosophy, and the Essay on Marcus Aurelius by Matthew Arnold. London, 1907, etc.

Mackail, J. W. Latin Literature. Pt 3. Ch. 5. London, 1895.

McQuige, J. D. Selections from the works of Fronto (English translation only). Rome, 1824.

Martha, Constant. Marc-Aurèle; in Les Moralistes sous l'Empire romain. Paris, 1881.

Meyer, H. Fragments of Roman oratory, pp. 609 ff. Zürich, 1842.

Mommsen, Th. The Provinces of the Roman Empire from Caesar to Diocletian. Vol. ii. Translated by W. P. Dickson. London, 1909.

—— Die Chronologie der Briefe Frontonis; in Herm. 8. Berlin, 1874.

Monceaux, P. Les Africains. Étude sur la littérature latine d'Afrique. Vol. i. Les païens. Paris, 1894.

—— Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique Chrétienne. 3 vols. Paris, 1905.

—— Apulée. Paris, 1889.

Müller, E. Marc-Aurel in seinen Briefen an Fronto. Progr. Ratibor. 1869.

Myers, F. W. H. Marcus Aurelius; in Essays Classical, no. 3. pp. 177 ff. London, 1888.

NETTLESHIP, H. The Noctes Atticae of Aulus Gellius; in Lectures and Essays. Vol. I. pp. 248 ff. Oxford, 1885.

NORDEN, E. Die antike Kunst-prosa. Leipzig, 1898.

OUDENDORP, F. Apuleius, Opera omnia (with preface by D. Rühnken). 3 vols. Leyden, 1786—1823.

PATER, WALTER. Marius the Epicurean. 2 vols. London, 1885.

PELLISSON, M. Rome sous Trajan. Paris, 1886.

PETER, H. Der Brief in der römischen Litteratur; in Abhandlungen der philologischen-historischen Classe der Königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Vol. 20. Leipzig, 1901.

PICHON, R. Les derniers écrivains profanes. Paris, 1906.

PRIEBE, C. De Frontone imitationem prisci sermonis Latini adfectante. Gymn. progr. Stett. 18.

RALEIGH, WALTER. Style. London and New York, 1897.

RENDALL, G. H. Marcus Aurelius Antoninus to Himself. (Translation, with introductory study on Stoicism and the last of the Stoics.) London, 1898.

ROTH, FR. Bemerkungen über die Schriften des M. Corn. Fronto und über das Zeitalter der Antonine. Munich, 1817.

ROUSE, W. H. D. Appendix to Casaubon's Translation of the Meditations. (King's Classics.) London, 1900.

SCHANZ, M. VON. Geschichte der römischen Litteratur. Vol. III. Munich, 1890, etc.

SCHWIERCZINA, Th. Frontoniana. Breslau, 1883.

SIMCOX, G. A. History of Latin Literature. London, 1867.

SITTL, K. Archaismus; in Commentationes Wölfflinianae. pp. 403 ff. Leipzig, 1891.

SMILEY, C. N. Latinitas and Ἑλληνισμός. Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, 143. Wisconsin, 1906.

STEELE, R. B. Chiasmus in the Epistles of Cicero, Seneca, Pliny, and Fronto; in Studies in honour of Basil Gildersleeve. Baltimore, 1902.

TAINE, H. A. Marc-Aurèle; in Nouveaux Essais de critique et d'histoire. Paris, 1896.

TEUFFEL, W. S. Geschichte der römischen Litteratur. Vol. II. Translated by G. C. W. Warr. London and Cambridge, 1900.

TOUTAIN, J. Les cités romaines de la Tunisie. (Vol. 72 of Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome.) Paris, 1896.

Valmaggi, L. I precursori di Frontone (reviewed in Jahresbericht 84). Ivrea, 1887.

—— Review of Beltrami's "Le tendenze letterarie," etc., vid. sup.; in Riv. di fil. 36, 1908 (April), p. 312.

Vogel, F. De A. Gellii copia vocabulorum. Zwickau, 1861.

Volkmann, R. Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer. Leipzig, 1885.

Warren, Minton. On a literary judgment of Fronto; in Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association 43. Boston, 1894.

Watson, P. B. Life of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. London, 1894.

Westermann, A. Geschichte der Beredsamkeit in Griechenland und Rom (2 pts). Leipzig, 1833—1835.

Whibley, Ch. Introduction to Adlington's translation of the Golden Ass. Vid. sup.

Wölfflin, Ed. Die Alliteration; in Mélanges Boissier, pp. 461 ff. Paris, 1903.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

BENEDICTINE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
870B78 C001
STUDIES IN FRONTO AND HIS AGE CAMBRIDGE
3 2811 00083 6066